DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 758 PS 005 036

AUTHOR	Hawkins, David F.; And Others
TITLE	Industry Related Day Care: The KLH Child Development Center. Part I.
INSTITUTION	KLH Child Development Center, Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Children's Bureau (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Clearinghouse for Research in Child Life.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	136p.
AVAILABLE FROM	KLH Child Development Center, Inc., 38 Landsdowne Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02139 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Care Centers; *Child Development; Childhood Needs; Day Care Programs; *Day Care Services; Decision Making; Early Childhood; Economically Disadvantaged; Environmental Influences; *Federal Government; Financial Support; Group Activities; Improvement Programs; Individual Development; *Industry; Minority Groups; Objectives; Program Evaluation; Projects; Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS	*KLH Child Development Center

ABSTRACT

The first of two reports describing and evaluating the creation and operation of the KLH Child Development Center, Inc., an industry-related child care center located in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is presented. The purpose of the report is to present the research design for the evaluation of the project and to discuss the expectations of the parties involved, their progress to date in establishing the Center, and the critical decisions made by these groups. The point is made that child care arrangements made by many working mothers among the disadvantaged minority groups are often inadequate. The environment for the proper development of the children of the disadvantaged is often of poor quality and even harmful. In recognition of the need to improve this situation, a Federal Panel on Early Childhood was established. A brief history of industry-related child care centers and the characteristics of this type of care are given. (Author/CK)

ED 059758

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INDUSTRY RELATED DAY CARE:

THE KLH CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER

PART I

PS 005036

Dr. David F. Hawkins
Harvard Graduate School of
Business Administration

Dr. Joseph R. Curran
Northeastern University
Graduate School of
Business Administration

John W. Jordan
Northeastern University
Graduate School of
Business Administration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
	The Environment for Development	2
	Child Care Arrangement Needs	2
	Unemployed, Underemployed and Unemployable	4
	Federal Panel on Early Childhood	5
	Industry-Related Child Care Centers	6
	A Brief History	6
	European Models	8
	Industry-Related Day Care	8
	Unique Characteristics	8
	Expected Advantages: Parents and Children	9
	Expected Advantages: The Company and Government	13
	The First Report	14
	The Second Report	16
II.	ANTICIPATED ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES	18
	Federal Government	19
	Federal Government: Possible Advantages	19
	Reduce Welfare Burden	19
	Generate More Taxable Income	20
	More Comprehensive and Less Costly	21
	Research	21
	Community Action	22
	New Source of Funds	22

	Page
Federal Government: Possible Disadvantages	22
Another Program to Administer	22
Fringe Benefit Issue	23
Community	23
KLH Demonstration Funding	24
Industry and KLH Involvement	26
The Industry: Potential Benefits	27
Widen Pool of Potential Workers	27
Increase Employment Term and Productivity	27
Lower Costs	28
Responsible Corporate Citizen	29
The Industry: Possible Disadvantages	29
High Risk	29
KLH Interests: Advantages and Disadvantages	30
Parents, Children and Community	31
Parents: Expected Benefits	31
Increase Lifetime Earnings	31
Convenience	32
Family Unification	32
Training Benefits	34
No Income Limits	35
Parents: Possible Disadvantages	35
Reduce Mobility	35
Child Transportation	35

	Page
Children: Expected Benefits	36
Educational and Social	36
Medical and Health Protection	37
Nutrition	37
Children: Possible Disadvantages	37
The Community: Potential Benefits	38
Low Cost	38
Human Resources Development	38
The Community: Possible Disadvantages	38
Potential Manpower Loss	39
Duplication of Effort	39
Exclusion	39
Second Report	39
III. THE CORPORATION AND THE CENTER	40
KLH Research and Development Corporation	41
The Center	42
Sources and Uses of Funds: 1967-1969	44
1969-1970 Budget	45
Parents Involved to Date	46
Prior Child Care Arrangements	48
Withdrawals	51
Participating Parent Reactions	51
Summary	54

		Page
IV.	MAJOR DECISIONS AND OBSERVATIONS	55
	Why a Program?	55
	What Kind of a Program?	58
	How Big a Program?	62
	How to Fund?	72
	Should the Center be Independent?	77
	Who is to Control the Center?	79
	When to Begin the Program?	89
	What Fees to Charge Parents?	91
	How are Children Enrolled?	94
	Lease or Buy a Building?	94
	Pick-Up Parents?	95
	Observations	96
	The Task Ahead	103
V.	RESEARCH PROPOSAL: THE BROAD OUTLINE OF PART II	106
	Effect on Children, Parents and Families	107
	Cost-Benefit Analysis	110
	Education	112
	Critical Decisions and Relationships	116
	Next Step	117
	Appendix A	
	Appendix B	

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
TABLE I	KLH Child Development Center, Inc. Sources and Uses of Cash 1967-1968	45a
TABLE II	Funds Expended by Sources as a Per Cent of Total Uses	45a
TABLE III	KLH Child Development Center, Inc. Sources and Uses of Cash 1968-1969	45b
TABLE IV	Funds Expended by Sources as a Per Cent of Total Uses	45b
TABLE V	KLH Child Development Center: 1969-70 Budget	45c
TABLE VI	Parent-Children Statistics	47a
TABLE VII	Prior Day Care Arrangements	49
TABLE VIII	Parents' Evaluation of Prior Day Care Arrangements	50
TABLE IX	Individual Parent Profile	50a

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

This is the first of two reports describing and evaluating the creation and operation of the KLH Child Development Center, Inc., an industry-related child care center located in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The purpose of this report is to present the research design for the evaluation of the project and to discuss the expectations of the parties involved, their progress to date in establishing the Center, and the critical decisions made by these groups. The report covers the time period from the spring of 1965 to February 1969. This period is bounded by two events: the decision by the KLH Research and Development Corp., a subsidiary of the Singer Company, to establish an independent parent controlled pre-school center for the children of employees, and secondly the moving of the Child Development Center into its first permanent facility--a renovated cold storage warehouse--adjacent to the KLH plant.

Between July 1968 and February 1969 the program had operated on a limited scale in a series of rented facilities in the Cambridge area. A second report will cover the activities of the fully operational program over a 12-month period beginning May 1969.

The research in this report and a substantial portion of the Center's operating costs have been funded by the Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. These grants were made with the expectation that the probability of disadvantaged people rising out of the poverty category (or failing to sink into it) would be greater if employers, parents and the community could join together to provide meaningful employ-

ment for parents and high quality education for their children through an integrated program operating in closely related work and education facilities.

THE ENVIRONMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT

Child Care Arrangement Needs

There are about 10 million women with children under 18 years of age in the labor force. Among this group the number of working mothers of pre-school children has increased more rapidly than the number of mothers with school age children. Approximately five million children of working mothers are less than six years old. In 1968 the Federal Panel on Early Childhood estimated that adequate day care facilities were available for fewer than 500,000 of these children.

Child care arrangements made by many working mothers among the disadvantaged minority groups are often inadequate. An older child, a neighbor or an unemployed father are most often cited as the day care solution. A pre-school child left in the care of an older child will get no care while the older child is in school. Unemployed fathers are rarely enthusiastic babysitters and arrangements with neighbors are sometimes very casual. Occasionally real damage can be done. There have been cases of young children locked out of their homes or on their own with keys strung around their necks, and children left at the mercy of emotionally unstable babysitters.

When it was decided to create the KLH Child Development Center the average child care center in Massachusetts was in many cases beyond the economic means of low income families. A 1966 study by the Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth stated that the "prevailing fees for full

time day care were generally too high for low income families.... Financial support for day care was generally inadequate. The facilities themselves needed more money for equipment, program materials, etc. and salaries paid to personnel in all types of facilities were uniformly low." The study, although not designed to be a cost analysis, also indicated the fees charged by day care centers did not appear to be related to either the cost of programs or to the amount of family income. Later, on June 20, 1966, fifty day care centers were closed in Boston because they failed to meet state standards for health and safety. Dr. Leon Toubenhaus, Massachusetts Deputy Commissioner of Community Health, said at the time that thousands of children were left daily in the hands of babysitters in centers which fail to meet minimum staffing or safety standards. In 1969 there were 5647 children in licensed day care situations in Massachusetts. This was far short of the estimated 50,000 who needed day care help.

Many mothers on welfare who desire to work have severe apprehensions as to the quality of care for her child. A 1968 study by the Labor Department of unemployment and under-employment in 10 areas of high poverty concentration found that one out of five slum residents who were not in the labor force but who wanted a regular job gave their inability to arrange for day care as the principal reason for not looking for work. A 1965 report of the Advisory Council on Public Welfare estimated that among the mothers receiving Aid to Families of Dependent Children, between 200,000 and 300,000 might become self-sufficient if appropriate training could be provided, if the jobs they could handle were available, and if suitable care was available for their children. If these conditions could be satisfied, it was estimated between 600,000 to 900,000 children might be re-

moved from poverty. The Advisory Council Report emphasized adequate child care was not enough. Training and jobs also had to be available to provide the incentive for the poor to enter the work force and leave the welfare rolls.

Unemployed, Underemployed and Unemployable

A 1966 survey of New York City welfare mothers by Dr. Lawrence H. Podell indicated 70 percent of the welfare mothers preferred to work rather than stay at home. Other surveys indicate that even though many welfare parents desire work, they are unemployable. A 1965 survey of Negro men actively seeking work through Jobs Clearing House, Inc. of Boston found that 60 percent of them were unemployable by the standards of Boston employers. In 1966 a Labor Department manpower survey of the Boston area showed 24 percent of working age Negroes, male and female, were either unemployed or underemployed.

The reasons for unemployment, underemployment and unemployability among Negroes and other disadvantaged segments of our society goes beyond discrimination. In many cases these people do not know how to work or even how to want to work. They do not know how to live in the society enjoyed by the bulk of the population. Welfare is all they know.

The KLH employee training and related day care program is a demonstration of one way the business community and government, working together, might help solve the present employment problems through employee training and prevent some future problems by removing children from the welfare environment.

Federal Panel on Early Childhood

In recognition of the need to improve and to expand child care programs and to encourage integration of services, an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act adopted by Congress in 1967 directed the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to coordinate their child care programs to attain common standards and regulations and to develop mechanisms for state and local coordination. At the request of President Johnson, the Secretary of HEW established the Federal Panel on Early Childhood, an inter-agency group on which were represented all the federal agencies having a direct or indirect part in the planning, funding, operation or support of programs for children.

The primary function of the Panel is to develop plans for the most effective use of operating, research, training and technical assistance funds available to each of the departments and agencies. One of the agencies, the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, funded the KLH Child Development Center.

The Federal Panel is primarily concerned with community child care programs and has established a plan called the Community Coordinated Child Care or 4-C program. Although the KLH program now in the demonstration stage is not technically a "community" center, it appears that for the most part its objectives are consistent with those of the 4-C program, which are:

1. Provide quality child care, child development and supportive family services to the maximum number of families possible, with top priority given to those families living in poverty.

2. Develop the most efficient, effective and economical methods for coordinating both existing and new child care programs.
3. Insure an effective voice in policy and program direction for the parents of children receiving child care.
4. Mobilize the resources of the community in such a manner so as to assure maximum public, private, agency and individual commitment, to provide expanded quality child care, and to insure the most efficient and effective use of such resources.
5. Respond first to the needs and wants of the families and children being served, and secondly to the administrative convenience of the participating agencies.

INDUSTRY-RELATED CHILD CARE CENTERS

A Brief History*

During World War II day care facilities were common in defense plants. The most outstanding example was the Kaiser Shipyards in Portland, Oregon, which sponsored an on-premise family centered child care program for children between 18 months and six years of age. The program was comprehensive in attending to family needs and would comply with today's minimum standards

*Based upon material contained in "A Proposal to Establish a Work-Related Child Development Center," written in May 1967 by Mrs. Gwen Morgan, former president of the KLH Child Development Center.

for child care as promulgated by the Federal Interagency Panel on Early Childhood. Kaiser Industries received money from the Maritime Commission to provide a building and equipment for its center of unusually high quality after which the industrial company and parents shared the operating expenses. The center was run directly by the company.

After the war very few defense plant day care facilities survived. A number of reasons have been cited for their decline:

1. The labor market ceased to be tight, thus there was no incentive for either government or industry to continue them.
2. During the war mothers were encouraged to work out of patriotism. After the war, they were expected to be homemakers.
3. People in the child welfare field became concerned with evidence of maternal deprivation in institutional situations.
4. The centers were costly. The Kaiser centers in particular were quite expensive to run.

War-time industries were less concerned with costs and, despite the expense, day care centers were essential to ensuring an adequate work force. Also, by working on government cost plus fixed fee contracts for ships, the centers could be considered a business expense which meant that the government was indirectly subsidizing the centers in full.

Today there are few industry-related child care programs of the high quality of the Kaiser Shipyards. Programs that do exist in industry are not usually of an educational nature. They are primarily conceived as a babysitting convenience for the workers.

European Models

Child care centers are common in Europe. In the Scandanavian countries, Italy and Germany, many of these centers are also connected with the parent's employment. In Russia there is more commitment to day care than anywhere else in the world. However, the philosophy of child care in the Soviet Union is not applicable to a democratic country. It appears that the aim of Soviet pre-schools is to weaken family ties, teach children to behave in acceptable ways, and condition children to accept official modes of thought.

The Scandanavian countries pre-schools are more appropriate models for American day care programs. New facilities are constantly being developed in those countries with government financing. High standards for staff and program are also made possible by government financial assistance. Health standards are high and auxiliary services, such as social workers and psychologists, are supplied through the child welfare department and local hospitals. Parental involvement is stressed.

INDUSTRY-RELATED DAY CARE

Unique Characteristics

Industry-based day care centers are similar in many ways to other types of day care centers. However, they have some unique features. Namely:

1. The mother and child are in close proximity to each other during the working day. The child is able to observe how the working parent spends his time when they are apart.

2. The child is with the parent longer during the day since the child comes to and from work with the parent.
3. The parents and teachers can develop a closer working relationship for the benefit of the child since they see each other at the start and the close of the day, and there can be opportunities for further contact during coffee and lunch breaks as needed.
4. The parent can be trained at the same place where he or she will be employed eventually on a regular basis.
5. No new child care arrangements need be made once the parent's training phase is over. Subsequently, as the parent's income rises and parent again need not make new day care arrangements.
6. Industrial-related day care involves government and industry working together under parent control.

Expected Advantages: Parents and Children

Some of the expected advantages of the KLH Child Development Center's pre-school programs and the related employment and training practices of KLH Research and Development for the parents and the children are as follows:

(1) Jobs and the training necessary for further advancement will be provided. In contrast to Job Corps and other government programs, the KLH program provides the unskilled worker with a job immediately. It also allows for the necessary training to provide opportunities for advancement within the company. The initial wage is considered good for unskilled assembly-line work. Opportunity for upgrading and advancement exists and advancement in pay scale is automatic with longer service.

The corporation believes that combining job opportunities and child care in a single package makes it both financially feasible for parents to work and saves them from having to make complicated arrangements for their children which some people are simply unable to do. In Massachusetts, for example, it is illegal for day care centers to open before 7:00 a.m., which is the time many shifts begin. Consequently, it is difficult for some mothers to leave their children at some of the existing day care centers and be at work on time.

(2) By providing non-exploitive jobs poverty may be alleviated and the welfare burden reduced. The wages paid for full time factory work at KLH are greater than the income one can legally derive from welfare. A higher level of income will not in itself produce any dramatic changes in family self-concept, unless the employee takes advantage of the new opportunity for self-development and advancement available to him. In particular, mothers now receiving AFDC funds may benefit from the wider choice of opportunities. They can, if they choose, become working members of a group, rather than living isolated and alienated on welfare.

Employment offers more than just income. A factory is a community and the worker has a recognized role in that community. With opportunities

for advancement, the working mother may grasp the satisfaction of being in charge of her life and her family's lives and not be dependent on welfare. Those who live in ghettoes can at least during the day be part of a wider social group which cuts across ethnic, class and religious barriers.

(3) <u>The education of the child will be of a high quality and may prevent later remedial programs</u>. There have been many studies by sociologists and child welfare specialists that have indicated that the richness of experience of various kinds in early childhood makes an important contribution to the intellectual development of an individual. Wann, Dorn, and Liddle in their book "Fostering Intellectual Development in Young Children" stated: "There is mounting evidence that intellectual development is far more significant in the period from three to six years of age than was formerly recognized.... The belief grew from observations which pointed to the great range of interest and knowledge of young children and to the apparent satisfactions they derived from gaining and possessing information."

Children from poverty or low income families often do not experience the environmental factors conducive to full intellectual and personality development. The Coleman Report is one of many studies that points out the disadvantaged child's sense of "powerlessness," a feeling that luck or fate determines success or failure rather than effort. A young child who sees his parent or parents crushed and defeated and sometimes separated by poverty, and who is himself inadequately protected, will not develop a feeling of his own power to affect his environment. He needs to learn in an environment characterized by opportunity and success, both for himself

and for the adults in his life.

The work-related child care Center at KLH proposes to provide this environment of opportunity and success. The child will have as a model a working parent rather than welfare support. He will gain a familiarity with the world of work and feel at home there through the school's association with an industry. Fatherless children will have an association with men who work. The relation of the school to the adult world gives a context to the education offered. The staff will be highly trained and health and social services provided as well as those of an educational nature. The child will be exposed to children of higher socio-economic backgrounds and thus will be enriched by the experiences of more advantaged children. By the same token, the opposite is true. Through such experiences the program expects to provide variety, strengthen family relationships, reduce socio-economic isolation, and create a sense of opportunity all of which should contribute to the development and later success of the child.

However, even if the school is successful in instilling a sense of vitality, personal worth and accomplishment in the child, there is the danger that he may regress after leaving. Consequently the Center, through the parent and with the parent can follow the child's progress closely after he enters the public school and provide guidance to the child and family during his early public school years. It is also possible that the upward mobility of the parent or parents because of higher incomes and better opportunities will exert a greater influence on the child. If the program is successful it is hoped that the need for costly remedial programs later in the child's life will be reduced.

(4) The location of the school allows for considerable parental involvement. The KLH pre-school programs provide maximum opportunity to include working families in their children's education since the pre-school is located directly adjacent to the factory. This close proximity allows the mother to visit and be visited, to offer advice and to learn. The child will not be separated from his mother. There will be less confusion of roles between mother and teacher and the children can be educated in a family centered atmosphere without excluding the parents from the process. Also, it is anticipated that meetings and group conferences for parents will be more easily arranged than in the normal day care situation. Parents and teachers daily develop informal relationships in reporting to one another.

(5) Many services needed in a pre-school can be provided by facilities already existing in the company. The facilities of KLH can add to the quality and efficient operation of the school. Printing and office facilities, purchasing, maintenance, auditing and health facilities will be available.

Expected Advantages: The Company and Government

The KLH Corporation anticipates that having a child care center will widen the labor pool from which it draws its workers, reduce absenteeism and tardiness, lead to higher productivity, reduce anxiety, and reduce turnover. If these benefits are achieved, there will be cost savings to the company.

The Government expects the program will provide needed day care, generate new sources of taxable income, reduce welfare dependency, and, if the cost benefits to industry can be adequately demonstrated, create

new sources of non-governmental resources for building and operating day care facilities.

THE FIRST REPORT

The principal objective of this first report is to describe and evaluate the activities to date at KLH's Child Development Center in such a way that others establishing similar centers can learn from KLH's experiences. Accordingly, this report will examine the expectations of the various parties involved in the activities of the Center, the social and business philosophy of those connected with the Center, and the critical decisions related to the development of the Center's policies, management practices, funding, physical facilities and educational programs. In addition, the relationship between the Corporation, the Center, employee-parents, community and others touched by the Center's program will be covered.

The particular questions answered by this report are:

1. Why is the federal government interested in industry-related day care? In particular, why was the Children's Bureau interested in the KLH Child Development Center?

2. Why is industry interested in child day care? In particular, why was the KLH Research and Development Corporation interested?

3. Why were parents interested? Why were the KLH parents interested?

4. What advantages and disadvantages might industry-related day care have for the children involved?
5. What can we learn from the KLH Child Development Center's experiences that might be of value to others? Specifically, if industry-related day care is thought to be desirable, how might it best be implemented?

This report will not give a detailed history of the Center.

Three important factors have made the scientific testing of a set of substantive hypotheses concerning the expected effects of the unique features of industry-related day care impossible before May 1969.

First, there was a strong desire in all of the parties involved to commence operations as soon as possible with a pilot group of children in order to test certain aspects of the program and to avoid worker frustration which might have arisen from a long delay between the announcement of the program and its implementation. Also there was an attempt to avoid frustration by the company in having a long delay between their putting funds into the project and their seeing any tangible aspects of the project.

Second, due to a variety of circumstances, the program was not operational at full capacity in a satisfactory industry-related facility before May 1969.

Third, due to a conflict between operational and research objectives, the Center's staff, the management of the Corporation, and an earlier research team failed to collaborate on a research program with strong experimental features which was acceptable to all parties. This led to a subsequent decision by the Children's bureau

that the present research team should not intervene in the activities of the Center with the purpose of structuring its activities to achieve research objectives during the Center's pilot operating period. Rather, the team should play a supportive role in helping the staff to make their program operational.

Given these conditions, and because of the widespread interest in the Center's activities, it was decided to limit the initial research effort and report to documenting the Center's experiences to date. It was felt these data would be of value to others contemplating the establishment of similar centers.

The material presented in this first report draws heavily from the various funding proposals prepared by Mrs. Gwen G. Morgan prior to and during her presidency of the Center, in particular, "A Proposal to Establish a Work Related Child Development Center," published in May 1967. In addition the researchers interviewed the parents who participated during the pilot period, the staff of the Center, the company members involved in the project, selected members of the Board of Trustees and advisory committees, and local officials. The records of the Center were also examined.

THE SECOND REPORT

The objective of the second phase of the research project will be to test the impact of the unique features of industry-related day care on:

(a) The children in the program.

(b) The employee-parents

(c) The company as a corporate entity as well as a community of people tied together by a common work environment.

(d) The Cambridge community.

In May 1969, the earlier barriers to scientific research no longer existed. As a result the Center's staff, directors and advisory board, in collaboration with the research team, developed a mutually satisfactory scientific research design to provide the data for the second report. The broad outlines of this research effort are presented at the end of this initial report.

II. ANTICIPATED ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

This section presents some possible answers to the question: "Why is the Federal Government, KLH Research and Development Corp., and its employees, interested in demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of industry related day care?" Since the advantages and disadvantages of industry-related day care have yet to be identified and proven, much of the material presented in this section is speculative. Nevertheless, it does represent the expectations of those involved in the program.

The Federal Government is actively seeking new ways to overcome a variety of social ills which result in poverty and personal degradation. The education of pre-school children and the employment of parents to enhance the quality of family life is a principal goal of these efforts.

In line with its responsibility the Federal Government has developed various policies and programs involving parent employment and early childhood education. Sometimes these employment and pre-school education programs are directly linked in one program. Other times they are only vaguely associated. New York City, for example, has three distinct programs dealing with employment and pre-school children's care: Group Day Care, Head Start, and Family Day Care programs. Group Day Care is designed to care for children at a facility while the parents are employed elsewhere. Head Start is geared toward education of children only, with the parents being employed by the program whenever possible. Family Day Care is structured so that parents go into training while children are cared for in a neighbor's home. Each of these programs are government instigated and organized with a mixture of federal, state, and local funding.

The proponents of industrial related day care believe this particular form of day care combines, from the point of view of the working parent, the beneficial aspects presently being derived from alternative day care programs. However, like these other day care activities industrial-related day care is subject to some of the criticisms common to all day care programs; e.g. preparing children for inadequate school systems. Since this report is focusing only on those aspects of industrial-related day care which are unique to this particular approach, those considerations common to all of the principal alternative variations of day care will not be discussed.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: POSSIBLE ADVANTAGES

When compared to existing day care programs the possible incremental advantages accruing to the government from industry-related day care include economic gains, better quality programs, a new opportunity to experiment, and increased corporate and employee involvement in community affairs.

Reduce Welfare Burden

From a cost-benefit standpoint the program has the potential to act as a catalyst in reducing welfare costs below their present level. It is anticipated that industry-based child care programs will permit some otherwise unemployed persons to become employed in dignified, gainful work. If this happens, unemployment and other welfare payments to such people could be eliminated or reduced. In addition, when a parent is gainfully

employed, his self-reliance and independence from government welfare may make him a more responsible and responsive citizen. An attitude of self-reliance may develop among the participants and carry over through their behavior, to their children and community.

Adaptation of pre-school education and non-exploitative employment programs should also help to widen the base of future working opportunities for poverty children when they eventually seek employment as adults. This again should reduce future welfare payments.

Generate More Taxable Income

In addition to possible welfare reductions, some portion of the government investment in child care programs may be returned in the form of increased taxable revenues. As the parents (and in time their children) eventually increase their income from steady work, new tax payments are likely to result. State governments may also receive higher tax receipts, through either personal income tax levies or sales taxes paid on dollars spent by program participants. In addition, as more dollars are spent these expenditures cause a greater movement of goods and services which, in turn, generally generates more employment opportunities and more taxable revenues.

Payments toward Social Security benefits should also increase. This increase ultimately will provide the individuals involved with a more adequate retirement plan since retirement benefits are related to contributions to the program.

More Comprehensive and Less Costly

Like many community child care programs, the industry-based child care program permits the consolidation of several services under one roof or, at least, one administrator. For example, in addition to guardian child care services and preventive health, pre-school education and family services may be offered. This can lead to cost reductions and improvement in the quality of services offered.

A parent will be able to go to a single agency in order to enroll the child, to provide medical services required for school entry and, to continue with employment or training processes in a coordinated fashion. Once enrolled, the child would be able to continue until he reaches school age. There is also a potential continuation of assistance to parents when the child becomes public school aged since the parent remains in proximity to the Center staff who know the child. No changes in agencies or withdrawals from programs would be necessary or required when and if a parent moved to a higher income bracket or became employed, as is the case in some Family Day Care Programs. The elimination of transfers between programs can lead to the avoidance of transfer costs, both human and financial.

Research

New methods and ideas for teaching children may be tested in an educational-employment related environment. For example, the center can react to the parent's training or employment schedules and gear its class sessions to the parents needs more readily than some other forms of day care. The continuing relationship of the parent to the center through the company may provide researchers with much valuable data more cheaply than presently is possible when the parent's relationship to the day care

center is less stable and more ill-defined.

Community Action

The program may lead to greater participation by employees and employers in the community. For example, parents are provided the opportunity to learn about educational systems and how to plan for their improvement since they will share in administering their own child's education. This experience should help them to work better as responsible parents with local school, city and political officials.

New Source of Funds

The resources of the federal government available for funding day care centers are limited and inadequate to close the gap between day care needs and the available places in existing day care programs. One potential source of additional funds is industry. If industry can be convinced through demonstration projects like the KLH Child Development Center project that it is in its interest to sponsor or continue to support work-related day care centers, the nation's day care facilities may be expanded more rapidly than otherwise would be the case.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: POSSIBLE DISADVANTAGES

Another Program to Administer

The adoption of a program which is industry-based brings with it new administrative responsibilities and costs. When funds are requested, an investigation is required for purposes of establishing justification, feasibility, etc. Even when circumstances are obviously favorable to such an enterprise the problem of resource allocation presents itself.

We are not saying that the additional administrative problems of industry-related day care are so burdensome that this innovative program should not be considered. However, new program alternatives present administrators with the task of deciding whether funds expenditures are warranted for the proposed program when compared to the needs, costs, and benefits of programs with similar objectives, such as the Group Day Care and Family Day Care programs. This is a time consuming task which an already over-burdened federal government staff must perform.

Fringe Benefit Issue

Having an industry-based program available for plant employees and community residents raises the question of whether or not the program is a fringe benefit and, as such, should be paid for completely with company funds. If the program makes working at the plant more desirable, it could be a deciding factor in gaining a new employee who would otherwise join another firm. If the program is viewed in these terms, it may put the government in the embarrassing position of appearing to subsidize private industrial fringe benefit programs.

Community

When capacity limits of the educational facility are approached, the assumed community advantages may disappear. For example, if there is room for only one more child and the choice must be made between the child of a prospective employee and the child of a non-working community resident, presumably the employee's child would be chosen to fill the vacancy. This kind of situation could well lead to a disintegration of industry-community relations.

KLH DEMONSTRATION FUNDING

The principal reasons why the Children's Bureau approved funding the KLH Child Development Center as a demonstration industry-related day care project were:

1. Since the corporation was established in 1957 it had been a socially responsible company, and as such was genuinely sympathetic to the needs of employees and the child care goals of the Children's Bureau.

2. The Children's Bureau believed the project to be financially feasible.

3. The company proposed to operate the Center as a non-profit organization independent from the company. This arrangement permitted parent control and removed the project from the "fringe benefit" category.

4. The Center agreed to participate in an independently conducted research program to evaluate the project. (The Children's Bureau is required to include in all demonstration funded programs a research element.)

5. The company had existing programs to hire, train and educate workers from the disadvantaged segments of society.

6. It was believed by the KLH management that a genuine need existed among the working mothers at KLH for better day care arrangements for their children.

7. The management group was committed to the establishment and successful operation of the Center under the proper restraints.

8. The company was highly regarded in the industrial community as a profitable, progressive, creative enterprise.

Since 1957, KLH Research and Development has consistently followed a non-discriminatory hiring and promotion policy and has actively sought qualified minority group applicants. The company works with the Massachusetts Employment Services, Jobs Clearing House Inc., and the NAACP Labor and Industry Committee in this effort, and has also contributed to the Opportunities Industrialization Center.

The production work at KLH facilitates a non-discriminatory employment policy. Most of the employees are semi-skilled assembly line workers. The company does not require prior work skills as a prerequisite to employment and no written tests are required. The worker is hired, often without any job skills, and is given on-the-job training of two to eight weeks duration on electronic assembly skills.

In addition to this training, the company offers courses for upgrading skills. Because of the varied ethnic groups represented in its work force, KLH has sponsored a program through which employees can study English at the factory after work, with a teacher supplied by the Cambridge Public Schools. This program has the potential for giving the participants an opportunity to compete for more responsible positions in the company and, for that matter, the electronics industry at large.

Besides its employment policies and in-company training programs, KLH has always been a profitable company. It has not laid off workers

since it was founded. The corporation has tried to develop a stable labor force through inventory control. It is not the policy of the company to hire for seasonal needs and lay off in slack times. The rate of employee turnover is well below the national average. The stable work force is an important characteristic as it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to institute a child care program in a company with a high turnover rate.

The management team at KLH was quite receptive to the concept of an industry-based child care center. Mr. Henry Morgan, the former President, and his wife Mrs. Gwen Morgan, were actively involved in public and private agencies concerned with child care. It was primarily through Mrs. Morgan's efforts that the proposal to found the KLH Child Development Center was accepted by the Children's Bureau. The Director of Personnel, the Controller, and other management people also contributed their time and efforts to assisting in developing the child care center at KLH.

Thus, the existing training programs, the composition of the work force, the attitude of management, and the company's existing resolve to create a day care center for their employee's children, made the KLH Child Development Center an ideal situation to demonstrate industry-related day care.

INDUSTRY AND KLH INVOLVEMENT

In order for managers in the industrial sector who are responsible to stockholders to consider actively pursuing work-related child day care programs identifiable benefits to the company must be expected. This

section will discuss those benefits and possible disadvantages that industry in general and KLH in particular might expect to derive from industry-related day care.

THE INDUSTRY: POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Widen Pool of Potential Workers

One of the expected benefits of a work-related day care center is that an employer in a tight labor market may be able to tap a new source of workers, particularly if his production process involves repetitive or manipulative procedures of the type that can be serviced best by female employees. Usually these employee skills, which are most often found in light manufacturing industries, require a short time to learn, little, if any, prior experience, and do not necessarily require a high level of education. Such jobs are often the only kind that disadvantaged parents can cope with and hold under current conditions.

Increase Employment Term and Productivity

Employee turnover may be reduced in those cases where an industry-based child day care program is available to workers who are adjusting to changing family needs. For example, a father whose children become motherless must seek proper care for his family. One alternative may include moving to a new location and seeking a higher paying position. But an industry-based child care center could be the answer to his needs. It could help him make his adjustment without changing jobs. Thus, the existence of a center may protect the company from a loss of its investment in training the employee.

Absenteeism may be diminished. The existence of the child care facility means working mothers need not be dependent upon unstable, sporadic babysitting arrangements. In many cases when the sitter is ill, the mother must remain at home. However, if work-related day care facilities existed a reliable staff would be available at all times. Similarly, in the case of young married couples, when short-term illness strikes the mother, the working father frequently must stay home to manage the household. If a work-related day care facility existed, the father need not stay home. He could bring the children to the center and continue to work. The mother could also spend longer periods recuperating.

Tardiness might be diminished. In Massachusetts day care centers do not open before 7:00 a.m., the time the KLH work day begins. Thus, it is very difficult for many single parents to get their children to a day care center and still be at work on time.

Many times workers who seek day care for their children have the added burden of delivering the children to the sitter or day care center. This added travel time would be eliminated since the child care center would be near the work site.

Lower Costs

Cost savings might be realized if tardiness and absenteeism are reduced. The need to hire more expensive or less experienced substitute workers and the frequency of shutdowns or slowdowns of manufacturing processes may be reduced. Furthermore, a more stable workforce might bring with it the benefits of lower costs of recruiting and avoidance of those costs related to employee turnover.

The quantity and quality of work from those employees that otherwise may have been adversely affected by family-related anxieties may

be improved if day care facilities are provided. Clearly, when a worker has his mind on family problems he cannot concentrate adequately on his task. He may not only perform poorly, but also endanger himself and his co-workers.

Additional cost savings may be realized if a considerable portion of the cost of developing the center is made in the form of in-kind support by the corporate sponsor.

These cost savings plus the fees paid by parents are expected to cover most of the costs of operating an industry-based child care center.

Responsible Corporate Citizen

Today it is commonly recognized that business corporations are an integral part of the local community. Opportunities should be available for employees to maintain an interest in the well-being of the community. The child care center can offer a company and its employees an outlet for participation in the economic development of the community at large. More importantly this is not merely an altruistic or paternalistic outlet: the program is geared to helping all, not just those in the lower socio-economic strata or in particular ethnic groups. No income restrictions are involved. Any parent who desires to have his children enroll in the program may do so. Child care centers are constructive outlets for business in the development of the community.

THE INDUSTRY: POSSIBLE DISADVANTAGE

High Risk

Industry-related day care programs might represent for some companies a high risk investment which could lead to undesirable consequences. The

center may become involved in labor negotiations as part of the wage and fringe benefit package. Unwise actions on the part of a center which is closely related in the minds of the public to the corporation may embarrass the company.

These and other similar possibilities could create a difficult dilemma for the sponsoring company: how can it leave the control of the center to its staff and parents, but at the same time protect itself and its name?

KLH INTERESTS: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

The KLH Research and Development Corp.'s principal interest in sponsoring a work-related day care center was the opportunity it provided the company to further expand its activities to reduce poverty and suffering among disadvantaged people. At the time the company decided to sponsor the center its work force was stable, turnover was low, productivity was high and of good quality, and there was no shortage of job applicants for available job opportunities. However, the management realized that it should take an interest in the care of children of working parents. Among the more disadvantaged employees with children there was a higher than average level of tardiness and absenteeism. A child care center appeared to be the answer for these parents.

The company's participation in this demonstration project involved some potential dangers: there were few historic patterns to follow as a basis for judging the risks. Many problems could not be foreseen and the company had to wait for them to develop. This meant the program had to be monitored continuously so as to detect problems early in their development and devise solutions to them before they got out of hand. This monitoring was not easy to do with the Center only a small, peripheral

part of a larger enterprise.

Being an innovator can also be expensive. It usually takes longer to get the program operational than initially planned and many alternative ways of doing new things must be tried, evaluated and discarded before the best course of action is achieved. In addition, given the extensive publicity the program has received in the press and the high expectations of the employees and management, a failure could not be sustained without a substantial negative effect on employee morale.

PARENTS, CHILDREN AND COMMUNITY

The day care program is expected to benefit both the parents and the children with important long term benefits to the community as a whole.

PARENTS: EXPECTED BENEFITS

It is anticipated the daily life of all members of a family participating in this program will be altered by their direct and indirect participation. It is expected that with the decrease in hardship the whole family will experience a net, permanent enrichment of their lives.

Increase Lifetime Earnings

The most obvious gain to those parents participating in the program is the opportunity it provides to those previously unemployed to gain employment and to those already employed to continue. This employment should result in a tangible, measurable increase in long term family income. In addition, the increased dignity of being able to support oneself independently of public welfare should lead to a greater psychic well-being.

Convenience

A number of working parents are inconvenienced by burdensome baby-sitting arrangements which may be costly and/or involve inconvenient travel requirements. This is a heavy burden for many working mothers to carry in addition to their other responsibilities as mother, wife and worker. For such parents industry-related day care provides a more satisfying alternative to their present day care situation at a lower dollar and personal cost. For example, before the Center was opened, one 32-year old mother would leave her home at 6:00 a.m., first to take her son to the local babysitter then to get to her assembly-line job at the KLH factory by 7:00 a.m. She was out of touch with him and any problems that might come up until she picked him up late in the afternoon. Now, according to this mother:

> "It's much more convenient. If anything happens I'm right there. I can look out the window and see him. I don't have to worry about him, that's the best thing."

Apparently this mother's point of view is representative of many other working mothers. Several surveys of the attitudes of parents using day care indicate that the majority of working mothers prefer day care centers located in the vicinity where they work, rather than in centers near their home.

Family Unification

Industry-related day care can increase a family's sense of being together and may in some cases actually help a family to remain together.

Many families, particularly single-parent families, are separated for a significant time because of the need for employment. The industry-based centers permit the parent to work near the child and to feel assured that a trained staff is present to handle childhood emergencies. In common with other forms of care programs industry-related day care allows the family to remain living under the same roof. It goes further, however, by permitting the family to be in closer proximity to each other during the day. As a self sustaining family a reduction of social alienation should follow because a working person becomes part of a community of fellow workers.

Moving day-care and work facilities closer together can lead to a more natural interaction between the parents, children and staff. This is expected to lead to some important benefits. For example, in the case of the KLH program, the parents bring their children to and from school and often stop for an informal discussion with the staff; occasionally they have lunch with their children and they are always close-at-hand in case of an emergency. Windows of the factory overlook the play yard and at coffee breaks interested parents often observe their children at play. In this way, the KLH parents have become more interested in their children's lives and the Center's program.

The staff of the Center believes this greater parental interest has increased the staff's ability to understand the children's total environment and its relationship to the child's continuing developmental process. This understanding, the staff believes, has permitted them to be more effective teachers and to integrate the Center into the child's total learning experience.

Training Benefits

In many respects industry-day care is similar to Group Day Care, Family Day Care or Head Start. However, one of the unique features of the program is that it tries to capture and combine the best features of these alternative programs by tying employee training, employment, and day care into one program. The employee training aspect of this package has at least four advantages for participating parents:

First, the parent receives training while employed at the plant or facility which will also provide a career opportunity. Thus, it is not necessary to attend a training school without earning wages, and then seek employment as a trained novice. The regular full-time employment opportunity exists at the training site.

Second, the employee-trainee can perceive the company expectation in a short period of time. This is particularly important for those who have never worked before. The company and employee get to know what can be achieved and what they can expect from each other at the outset.

Third, the trainee-parent can develop skills in a small social group which can be put to work together as a team under the direction of other experienced employees. Thus, an atmosphere of opportunity and reduced anxieties is created which in turn, makes the work experience more acceptable to all concerned.

Fourth, the training experience does not terminate with the initial sessions or with initial employment. The training can be continued through the development of the employee's career.

No Income Limits

Under the industrial-related day care qualification procedures the parent is not forced to make new arrangements for children when (a) the training period ends, or (b) his or her income level improves. Thus, unlike many other public-sponsored day care programs, the parent can continue to use the center without penalty for achieving higher wages as a reward for good work. The only result of wage increases is a slightly increased per child cost to the family commensurate with the new wage level.

PARENTS: POSSIBLE DISADVANTAGES

Parents who participate in the pre-school industry-based day care program may experience some inconveniences.

Reduce Mobility

If the parent were to become tied too closely to a particular job location because of the related day care arrangements, he or she might be very reluctant to leave the present position, even though a new job provided improved salary and position. Thus, the wage and salary of a parent might be directly affected by the involvements in the school. Alternatively, if a parent who was removed from a welfare status after employment was to leave the company and seek welfare again, reprocessing of welfare applications would be necessary. In some cases this can consume a considerable amount of the applicant's time and payments may be delayed until this application was approved.

Child Transportation

Transportation of a child to and from work can be a problem for some

parents when a child must go to the day care center location with the parent. For example, public transportation facilities may be crowded or irregular. Also, if the company starts early in the morning, the child may in some cases be awakened earlier than usual and in winter forced to travel long distances in cold or inclement weather. As the KLH pilot period indicates the methods of transportation and the conditions of travel to and from work can be burdensome for the parent and tiring for the child. Also, if a welfare parent decides to go to work and to have a child participate in the center, there may be older school age children who must still be provided with proper supervision during after school hours and the summer months when school is recessed.

CHILDREN: EXPECTED BENEFITS

In the child's interest, a properly run day care center should provide a continuous, meaningful educational experience as well as needed health care protection. There are no reasons why industry-day care should not be able to meet these standards of performance. Nevertheless, while industry-related day care does promise some unique benefits for the child, it is open to some of the same criticism as other forms of day care.

Educational and Social

To the extent that the work force is drawn from a wider segment of the population than exists in the child's home community, work-related day care may provide a richer environment for learning and should be a broadening social experience through interaction with other children and adults. Of course, the full benefits of day care would accrue to those children who do not have adequate day care now but who would if the parent worked. As a participant in the industry-based day care program the child is re-

moved from his daily home environment which can be monotonous and limited in scope. A parent or babysitter may not have the skill, desire, temperament, resources, etc. to create learning situations day after day.

In addition to the many social benefits day care brings to disadvantaged children, in an industry-based center the child will also have a model of a working parent. This influence plus the school's association with the company, should give the child valuable knowledge about the world of work and the personal habits demanded by work situations.

Medical and Health Protection

Industry-related day care, like other alternative forms of day care, removes the child from the dangers of unqualified supervision and exposure to unchecked childhood diseases. The child health care and protection programs can be developed by trained company staff. Regular medical checkups for the children that tie in with parent-company health programs can catch maladies such as inadequate vision or hearing defects early enough to permit correction at low cost and before any permanent damage has been done. In addition, a working agreement with the company nurse and the local hospital can provide for protection in case of emergencies.

Nutrition

Through the utilization of the company's cafeteria and dietetical services the nutritional needs of the children may be met better than in other alternative day care programs. Often the other programs rely upon some staff member to double as part-time cook.

CHILDREN: POSSIBLE DISADVANTAGES

Since a child's participation in the day care center may be dependent upon the parent being an employee of the participating company, should

the parent change jobs the child would have to withdraw from the program. This could possibly lead to frustration and disappointment on the part of the child which might not be experienced in a non-work related day care situation.

THE COMMUNITY: POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Low Cost

The community at large has the opportunity to participate in the benefits which flow from the existence of an industry-based child development program. These benefits should be obtained without any direct commitment of capital or operating funds.

The funds generated by employment of the otherwise not employed individuals enhances the economic development throughout the community. Local income tax (city, state, etc.) revenues are increased directly; sales taxes flow when earnings are spent. New jobs are also expected to be created.

Human Resources Development

Through the educationally-oriented industry-based child care center, educational benefits for the children will increase the potential for the development of the community's human resources. This benefit is important when no comparable pre-school programs are available or when the physical capacity of the existing programs is restricted.

THE COMMUNITY: POSSIBLE DISADVANTAGES

The circumstances which make a community receptive to industry-based child development programs must be of a nature which permits a service gap to be filled. It should not result in disruptions within existing systems.

Potential Manpower Loss

Having a new educational program creates the possibility for "manpower piracy." For example, the center may attract the better teachers away from local school systems. This danger can be avoided if the center purposely seeks its teachers from other communities where there is an excess of qualified teachers or if it avoids great discrepancies in salaries offered.

Duplication of Effort

It is possible that some parts of an industry-based day care program duplicate the efforts of existing community programs. Head Start programs for example, are geared toward educating pre-school disadvantaged children. Suppose for example, children are taken out of Head Start and put into an industry based day care program and are not replaced in Head Start by other children. Head Start then operates at less than full capacity without any significant cost reductions.

Exclusion

When the industry-based child development center approaches physical capacity the community resident may not be able to take advantage of the facility because residents of other communities who are employed at the sponsoring company have children with a desire to attend. This exclusion of local residents could cause some resentment.

Second Report

The second phase of the research will test to see if expected benefits to the government, corporation, parents, children and community are realized. The research design for this second phase is presented in Section V of this report.

III. THE CORPORATION AND CENTER

By working together the Child Development Center and KLH seek to implement a common belief that the development of human resources is a desirable and feasible way to bring about a permanent increase in the ability of individuals, groups, and communities afflicted with poverty. It is thought that the development of these human resources should be sought at both the parental and early childhood levels by two closely related efforts: first, the improvement of the family's economic position through employment and second, the escalation of the potential for achievement in pre-school children by creating a comprehensive interdisciplinary and socio-economic environment for learning. This environment will be designed to reduce the problems of poverty which take root when the young child's aspirations for healthy growth, learning, articulation of needs, and achievement are not realized.

The initial motivation leading to the establishment of the Center in 1965 was described as follows by the then President of the Corporation, Mr. Henry Morgan:

> In the spring of 1965 KLH decided it would be desirable to try to find a way to provide good child care for its workers, since little acceptable child care was available in the community. The management's motivation was not that the labor supply was inadequate; at that time, there was an average of seven applicants for each job at KLH. Instead, we hoped to be able, with such care available, to offer employment to some mothers on welfare. Planned expansion called for hiring 70 additional workers the following fall, and we hoped to make a contribution to reduce poverty in our area by hiring women from the welfare rolls.

Subsequently, in May 1967, the Center's president, Mrs. Gwen G. Morgan stated the joint objectives of the Corporation and the Center in a proposal

she prepared for distribution to potential sources of funding:

> The aim of this proposal is to attach problems of unemployment and unemployability on several fronts. First, the company will continue to hire at non-exploitative pay scales from groups which are discriminated against in Boston hiring practices: Negroes, non-English speaking immigrants, women with children, parolees, alcoholics, the physically handicapped. Second, the company will continue to hire people without skills, and will provide job training at company expense. Third, the parents will operate a school providing child care, so that some mothers will have the option of working rather than poverty or welfare dependency. And Fourth, the school will try to get at the roots of unemployability through early childhood education and care, and will try to give the children the opportunity and tools they need to succeed.

In January 1968, Mr. Morgan was discharged as president of KLH. His successor, Mr. Robert Elman, has continued to support the Center.

KLH Research and Development Corporation

The KLH Research and Development Corporation had annual sales in 1968 of $17 million and employed 660 people. Its principal products are radio phonographs, loudspeakers, components, accessories and radios. In 1964 when Singer acquired the company, the KLH Research and Development Corp., employed 250 people. Its annual sales were then $4 million.

A large segment of the corporations' work force comes from disadvantaged minority groups. About 35 per cent of the supervisory and non-supervisory work force is black. In addition, approximately 10 per cent of the work force are Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking employees and almost 5 per cent are Portuguese-speaking. A little more than 50 per cent of all employees are women and over 40 per cent of these women are Negroes. The corporation also employs handicapped persons, parolees and former alcoholics. Its work force is drawn from many Boston suburbs, with about one-third living in the hardcore poverty areas located in Roxbury-Dorchester-South

End district of Boston.

The Center

The KLH Child Development Center, Inc. is a non-profit corporation managed and controlled independently from the KLH Research and Development Corp., by participating parents and others. The Center provides educationally-oriented day care to employees' pre-school children between the ages of 2½ and 6. KLH employs the parents and where necessary, provides on-the-job training to develop the parents' skills needed for initial employment or subsequent advancement.

Before moving into its permanent facilities the Center's enrollment was limited to 14 children. The budgeted enrollment for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969 is 60 children.

The Center's objective is to provide a high quality educational program for the children and a superior in-service training program for the staff. The Center has set for itself a standard of 1 teaching-related adult for every 5.5 children. Accordingly, the projected 1969-70 teaching staff includes a Head Teacher, two teachers and eight teaching aides. The budgeted staff also includes a director, and an assistant director who is a trained social worker. In addition to his administrative tasks the assistant director will work with the parents as a family consultant. The staff is interracial and includes both men and women. Because of the long work day, the staff works staggered hours.

The schedule for a typical day at the Center is:

A.M.

6:45-7:00	Children of plant employees arrive with parents (the work day for factory workers at KLH is from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.).

7:00-8:30	Free play
8:00-8:30	Breakfast
8:30	Children of office employees arrive (the work day for office employees is from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.).
A.M.	
8:30-10:00	Group activities
10:00-10:15	Snack
10:15-11:30	Group activities
11:30-12:00	Lunch
P.M.	
12:00-2:00	Young children sleep. Older children have supervised activities until 1:30 p.m. when they rest until 2:00 p.m.
2:00-2:30	Wake up and snack
2:30-3:30	Individual projects
3:30	Children of plant employees leave.
5:00	Children of office employees leave.

The Center operates year-round except for a two week period in July when the plant is closed for summer vacations. The Center occupies a building adjacent to the KLH plant with a floor space of 10,000 square feet. The facilities include an outdoor play area, three classrooms, a parent's room, a health room for children well enough to be brought to school but not well enough to mix with other children, a kitchen, a large common room used as an indoor play area and lunch room, several offices, and two toilet areas for children. The building is leased by the Center for $12,000 per year plus utilities and taxes.

Run as a non-profit corporation the Child Development Center is supervised by a Board of Trustees. It is cooperatively owned and operated by

the emplovee-parents of the enrolled children, the nine original incorporators, and others who may be so designated by the Board of Trustees. Membership in the corporation is automatic for employee-parents, annual for voted members, and life-long for incorporators. The eleven-man Board of Trustees is elected by the members of the corporation. As of May 1, 1969 the Board of Trustees consisted of the following persons:

Samuel J. Braun, M.D. - President
F. Kate Bulls - Executive Director
Kav Burke - KLH Personnel
Rick Challet - KLH Sales Manager
Naomi Daley - KLH Parent
Arthur Finch - resigning June 1, 1969 - Community representative
Jacqueline Kloss - Parent from community
Rod MacLeod - Treasurer, KLH
Helen Rochlin - Community
Ronald Rozett, M.D. - Community
Nettie Williams - KLH, Parent
Dave Richardson is Clerk of the Corporation

Parents may work on Board Committees and serve as members of the Board of Trustees. Children of KLH employees, of other members of the corporation, of the Center's staff, and of the members of the Board of Trustees are eligible for the school. Preference is given however to emplovee's children. The weekly tuition ranges between $5 and $20 per child, depending upon the parent's income and number of children attending the school.

Source and Use of Funds: 1967-1969

Since July 1, 1967 the principal source of funds for the KLH Child Development Center has been grants from the U.S. Children's Bureau. For the fiscal years 1968-69 and 1969-70 these grants will total $112,118 and $147,782, respectivelv. They will also include the cost of research. As of April, 1969 the other major source of funds has been donations of $39,636

from several foundations and individuals interested in demonstration projects involving work related day care. The KLH Research and Development Corp. has given the Center $36,863 which includes various in-kind services of $15,363.

As of April 30, 1969 the major uses of funds have been as follows: operations, about $126,000; renovations of the warehouse acquired for the Center's permanent facility, nearly $36,000; and architects fees for a facility that was never used, slightly more than $18,000. The cost of research to date has been $16,000.

Tables I through IV present a more detailed analysis of cash sources, uses and balances for the periods July 1, 1967 to July 30, 1968 and July 1, 1967 to April 30, 1969.

1969-1970 Budget

Including a research item of $25,000, the Center's 1969-70 budgeted operating expenditures total $177,426. Table V presents the Center's 1969-1970 budget as prepared by the staff.

The projected sources of funds to meet the 1969-1970 expenditures are as follows:

Children's Bureau grant	$147,782
Tuition	4,000
Services in-kind	6,000
Donations and other sources	19,644
Total	$177,426

Based upon budgeted 1969-1970 enrollment of 60 children, the budgeted annual cost per child (excluding the research grant and amortization of

TABLE I

KLH Child Development Center, Inc.

Sources and Uses of Cash

July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Sources:		
KLH Corp/Singer	$10,363*	
Government D-288	63,995	
Donations-Other	17,818	
Tuition and Other	----	
Total		$92,176
Use:		
Operations:		
Rent	$ 3,750	
Salaries	23,662	
Other	12,663*	
Architect Fees	12,763	
Renovation	----	
Research	----	
Total		$52,838
Unexpended Funded Balance		$39,338

*Includes documented out-of-packet services-in-kind, of $7,863.

TABLE II

Funds Expended by Sources as a Per Cent of Total Uses

July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Source	Source Expenditures	Per Cent
KLH/Singer	$10,363	18
Government	24,657	47
Donations-Other	17,818	35
Total Uses	$52,838	100

TABLE III

KLH Child Development Center. Inc.

Sources and Uses of Cash

July 1, 1968 - April 30, 1969

Sources:		
KLH Corp/Singer	$26,500*	
Government D-288		
D-288 C 1	74,054	
Donations - Other	21,818	
Tuition and Other	2,640	
Total 1968 - 1969		$125,012
Total Available to Use		$164,350
Use:		
Operations:		
Rent	$19,648	
Salaries	46,325	
Other	19,703*	
Architects Fee	4,868	
Renovations	35,638	
Research	16,193	
Total		$142,375
Unexpended Funded Balance		$ 21,975

*Includes estimated out-of-packet service-in-kind of $7,500.

TABLE IV

Funds Expended by Sources as a Per Cent of Total Uses

July 1, 1968 - April 30, 1969

Source	Source Expenditures	Per Cent
KLH/Singer	$26,500	18
Government	91,417	65
Donations - Other	21,818	15
Tuition and Other	2,640	2
Total Uses	$142,375	100

TABLE V

KLH Child Development Center: 1969-70 Budget

1. Personnel	Annual Salary Rate	% Time on This Project	Amount Requested Federal Funds	Amount Available from Other Sources of Applicant (Non-Federal)	Total
Director	15,000	100	15,000		
Assistant Director	13,000	100	13,000		
Head Teacher	10,000	100	10,000		
Teacher	8,000	100	8,000		
Teacher	7,000	100	7,000		
Teacher Aides	33,904	100	25,584	8,320c	
Nurse	1,500	12		1,500b	
Clerical	6,000	100	3,000	3,000b	
Medical & Dental	500			500b	
Maintenance	1,000			1,000a	
Cleaning	2,200			2,200a	
Snow Removal	300			300a	
Research Subcontract	25,000		25,000		
FICA, Retirement, Insurance, etc.	12,122		10,198	1,924c	
			116,782	18,744	135,526
2. Supplies					
Program Supplies			1,700	400c	
Office Supplies & Postage				900a	
Food			6,800	4,000b	
			8,500	5,300	13,800
3. Travel					
Field Trips, Clinic				4,000c	
Professional Travel, Dues & Subscriptions			1,500		
			1,500	4,000	5,500
4. Equipment					
Program			1,000		
			1,000		1,000
5. Other Expenditures					
Rental of Space (Electricity Taxes, Heat)			20,000		
Telephone				600a	
Insurance				1,000a	
			20,000	1,600	21,600

TABLE V (Continued)

KLH Child Development Center: 1969-70 Budget

	Annual Salary Rate	% Time on This Project	Amount Requested Federal Funds	Amount Available from Other Sources of Applicant (Non-Federal)	Total
6. Total Direct Costs			147,782	29,644	177,426
7. Indirect Costs			0	0	0
8. Total Costs			147,782	29,644	177,426
a Services In-Kind					
b Cash from KLH Research and Development Corp.					
c Tuition Receipts					

leasehold improvements and other depreciable assets) is approximately $2,500 or $50 per week. An examination of the budgeted costs shows that the bulk of the Center's costs are fixed over the budget period. The major cost items that vary with the level of activity are salaries for teacher's aids, food, supplies and travel. For example, after converting the staff's 1969-1970 fixed budget into a variable budget it indicates that, at a 30-student level of operations the 1969-1970 annual budgeted expenditure is about $120,000 excluding research and depreciation. This is equivalent to an annual cost per student of about $4,000, or $80 per week.

Parents Involved to Date

All parents participating in the pilot program were interviewed by the research team. Their employment, racial and marital profile, evaluation of the program, and reasons for enrollment are presented in this section.

Fifteen employee parents and sixteen children participated at one time or another in the Center's pilot program during the period of limited enrollment between July, 1968 and April, 1969. Four of these parents were married couples who during this period were both employed by the corporation. In addition to the KLH employee group, an additional parent and child participated. This parent, who was a working mother with a nearby Cambridge company, was sponsored by a member of the Board. The purpose was to gain experience in enrolling working parents from other Cambridge companies. It had been suggested by some Board members that the Center's cost per student would be less if its fixed costs could be spread over more children than available just from KLH.

The characteristics of the sixteen participating parents were:

- Forty-four per cent (44%) were white, twenty-five per cent (25%) black and the remaining thirty-one per cent (31%) included people of Puerto Rican, Mexican, Columbian and Indonesian descent.
- Ten of the parents were under 30 years of age. The average age of the group was 28.9 years.
- The marital status of the group was: 11 married, 1 divorced, 3 single and 1 separated.
- One parent had "some college;" eleven parents were graduates of high school; and, four parents had "some high school."

It is difficult to evaluate the quality of some of the parents' high school education since five of them were educated in foreign schools and two received high school diplomas from all black schools in North Carolina and Mississippi.

In February, 1969 nine parents, including one married couple, and ten children were enrolled in the program. Between July, 1968 and this date seven parents, including one married couple and seven children withdrew from the program. Table VI shows selected characteristics of those parents and children enrolled in the program at the end of the pilot study period (Group A) and those parents that withdrew from the program during this period (Group B).

The employment and salary characteristics of Group A and B parents differ. Group B parents tended to be more highly paid and to have worked longer with the corporation. Eight of the nine Group A parents were employed in unskilled jobs and their average length of employment at KLH

TABLE VI

Parent-Children Statistics

Group A	Group B	Total
In Program	Participated-Withdrew	
9 Parents (incl. one married couple)	7 Parents (incl. one married couple)	16 Parents
10 Children	7 Children	17 Children
	Parents	
Ethnic:		
White - 2	White - 5	White - 7
Black - 4	Black - 0	Black - 4
Other - 3	Other - 2	Other - 5
Ages:		
Under 30 - 4	Under 30 - 6	Under 30 - 10
30 - 40 - 4	30 - 40 - 1	30 - 40 - 5
Over 40 - 1	Over 40 - 0	Over 40 - 1
Avg. Age - 30.3	Avg. Age - 27.1	Avg. Age - 28.9
Marital:		
Married - 7	Married - 4	Married - 11
Divorced - 1	Divorced - 0	Divorced - 1
Single - 1	Single - 2	Single - 3
	Separated- 1	Separated- 1
Sex:		
Male - 2	Male - 4	Male - 6
Female - 7	Female - 3	Female - 10
Education:		
Some College - 0	Some College - 1	Some College - 1
High School Graduate - 7	High School Graduate - 4	High School Graduate - 11
Some High School - 2	Some High School - 2	Some High School - 4
	Children	
Ethnic:		
White - 2	White - 5	White - 7
Black - 6	Black - 0	Black - 6
Other - 2	Other - 2	Other - 4
Ages:		
2½-3½ - 3	2½-3½ - 2	2½-3½ - 5
3½-4½ - 3	3½-4½ - 3	3½-4½ - 6
4½ 6 - 4	4½ 6 - 2	4½-6 - 6
Sex:		
Male - 5	Male - 5	Male - 10
Female - 5	Female - 2	Female - 7

was slightly less than two years. In Group B three of the six parents held skilled jobs while the average length of employment was slightly more than three years. Because of this disparity in length of employment and job level there is a difference in the average salary for the two groups. Group A's average salary was $4755; whereas, Group B's average salary was $5577.

In evaluating prior employment experience it is apparent that the move to KLH was of a lateral nature for 15 of the 16 parents. Only one parent in both groups had any prior experience in other than an unskilled job.

There is also a considerable variance in average salary on the jobs immediately prior to KLH employment. In Group A figures were available for six of the nine parents. Their average salary was $3346. In Group B the average for six of the nine parents was $3070. (These figures can be misleading as they do not reflect cost of living increases and include at least three parents who were employed only part-time prior to joining KLH).

Group A families had a significantly higher median family income than Group B families. Group B families had a slightly higher average family income than Group A families. In Group A, five of the nine parents reported other sources of income from other working members of the family. The five parents include a married couple, both of whom were employed at KLH. This additional income increased the Group A average <u>family</u> income to $7744 with a median of $8164. In Group B, only three parents reported other sources of income and two of the three were married to each other and were employed by KLH. The average <u>family</u> salary for the Group B was $7922 with a median of $5408.

Prior Child Care Arrangements

The analysis of the prior child care arrangements of those employee parents participating in the pilot program includes eight parents in Group A and six in Group B. (For the purpose of this analysis the married couples are treated as one parent). Table VII presents an analysis of the 14 parents' prior day care arrangements.

TABLE VII

Prior Day Care Arrangements

Prior Arrangements	Group A	Group B	Total
Nursery	2 (25.0%)	0	2 (14.2%)
Wife/Relative (at home)	1 (12.5%)	4 (66.67%)	5 (35.8%)
Relative* (away)	0	2 (33.33%)	2 (14.2%)
Babysitter (at home)	1 (12.5%)	0	1 (7.2%)
Neighbor* (away)	4 (50.%)	0	4 (28.6%)
Totals	8 (100%)	6 (100%)	14 (100%)

*Parents must take child to home of relative or neighbor.

It is difficult to draw any conclusions from Table VII. However, it may be significant that eight of the 14 parents (57.0%) had child care arrangements which required taking the child to a location away from the home and six of these eight were still in the program at the end of the pilot study period. Also, of the six parents who withdrew from the program, four had previously had "at home" babysitting arrangements. To put these figures in perspective however, it is important to note that the parent interviews indicated the travel involved in taking children to these away

from home day care facilities was not a problem in any cases. This is significant when compared to the common complaint among many parents that taking their children to the KLH Center is burdensome.

The parents were further asked to rank their prior babysitting arrangements on a three point scale: "Satisfactory" - "Acceptable" - "Unsatisfactory." Table VIII summarizes these rankings (each married couple is counted as one parent for this tabulation). It indicates the majority of the parents (64.3%) did no consider their prior day care arrangements "unsatisfactory." In this respect, Group A and B are similar. Sixty-two per cent of Group A parents and sixty-seven per cent of Group B parents rated their prior day care arrangements "acceptable" or better.

TABLE VIII

Parents' Evaluation of Prior Child Care Arrangements

	Group A	Group B	Combined
Satisfactory	2 (25.0%)	3 (50.0%)	5 (35.7%)
Acceptable	3 (37.5%)	1 (16.7%)	4 (28.6%)
Unsatisfactory	3 (37.5%)	2 (33.3%)	5 (35.7%)
Total	8 (100%)	6 (100%)	14 (100%)

The parents' weekly cost of child care prior to enrolling in the pilot program was higher than the fee charged by the Center in most cases. Prior child care costs for the seven Group A parents ranged from $8 to $18 per week. The cost of prior day care could only be obtained for three Group B parents. In one case there was no cost as the wife of the employee took care of the child. In each of the other two cases it was $15 per week,

TABLE IX
Group A
Individual Parent Profile

Parent Code Number	Sex	Means of Transportation	One Way Travel Time	Prior Child Care		KLH Weekly Child Care Cost	No. of Children Enrolled	Parents** Evaluation of Prior Day Care	No. of Parents in Household	Comments
				Type	Weekly Cost					
1-2*	M-F	Walk	20 min.	Neighbor	$10	$9.50	1	S	2	Both parents work for KLH.
3	F	Bus & Subway	45 min.	Nursery	$11	$5.00	1	A	1	
4	F	Car	20 min.	Neighbor	$18	$23.00	3	U	2	Husband employed.
5	F	Two Buses	45 min.	Neighbor	$ 8	$5.00	1	A	1	Neighbor who baby-sat went to work.
6	F	Two Buses & Subway	60 min.	Neighbor	$16	$10.00	1	U	2	Husband employed, but in ill health.
7	M	Car	10 min.	Babysitter	$15	$5.00	1	U	2	Recently married. Wife cares for a new baby at home.
8	F	Car	1 hr.	Nursery	$12	$18.50	1	A	2	Husband works.
9	F	Car	25 min.	Relative	0	$13.50	1	S	2	Husband works.

*Married Couple--both work for KLH. **S = Satisfactory, A=Acceptable, U=Unsatisfactory

TABLE IX (continued)
Group B
Individual Parent Profile

Parent Code Number	Sex	Means of Transportation	One Way Travel Time	Prior Child Care Type	Prior Child Care Weekly Cost	KLH Weekly Child Care Cost	No. of Children Enrolled	Parents** Evaluation of Prior Day Care	No. of Parents in Household	Comments
10	M	Car	20 min.	Wife	0	$6.50	1	A	2	Wife looked after sibling at home. Participating child withdrawn for health reasons will re-enroll at a later date.
11	M	Bus	30 min.	Relative	$15	$4.00***	1	S	2	Both parents work. Child withdrawn because of accident at Center. One sibling not enrolled in Center. $15 prior care cost for 2 children.
12-13*	M-F	Car****	20 min.	Relative	$15	$5.00	1	U	2	Mother left KLH at end of pilot study period. Now cares for child. Withdrew child because of shift change. Will re-enroll when permanent facility opens.
14	F	Car****	35 min.	Relative	0	$3.00***	1	S	1	Problem with method of instruction, has recently reinstated her child in program.
15	M	Car****	40 min.	Relative	0	$8.00	2	U	1	Left area for personal reasons.
16	F	Bus****	30 min.	Relative	0	$5.00	1	S	1	Left area for personal reasons.

*Married couple--both work at KLH. **S=Satisfactory, A=Acceptable, U=Unsatisfactory
***Fee charged prior to establishment of fee scale. ****Left Company (husband of married couple combined KLH employment).

although in one case the fee was for two children. The average weekly cost of day care per child for all parents enrolled in the Center at one time or another during the pilot period was $7.30. Table IX presents data related to child care costs as well as other miscellaneous parent information, such as the time and mode of parent travel to and from work, on a parent by parent basis.

Withdrawals

Of the original seven parents in Group B (including the married couple) four have left the company. This includes the wife of the married couple who now takes care of her child at home. The father has continued to work at KLH. In this case the child was withdrawn because the father's shift hours were changed, and it was inconvenient for him to take the child to the temporary facilities used during the pilot study period. These new shift hours will not raise the same problem in the permanent facility location. The child will probably be re-enrolled in the program in the near future. Of the remaining two parents still working at KLH, one parent withdrew her child because of misgivings about the staff supervision. (Her child was involved in a minor accident.) The other parent withdrew her child after the child became ill. This parent subsequently informed the Center that she would re-enroll her child when the center moves to its permanent facility.

Participating Parent Reactions

The nine parents participating in the program at the end of the pilot period were interviewed to determine their feelings about their prior child care arrangements and their reactions to date concerning the Child Development Center. The interviews were conducted in an informal fashion and the

parents appeared to be very candid in presenting their views.

Regarding their prior child care arrangements transportation was considered very important. On the positive side, parents with children in a nursery school were generally pleased with the nursery's pick-up service. Other parents stated that transportation of the child was no problem if their babysitter was in the neighborhood.

Most reactions toward prior child care arrangements were negative. The following examples are cited:

- Most parents did not completely trust the babysitter.
- The babysitter or relative caring for the child did not allow the child to play or "make noise" and in the parent's opinion this might retard the child's normal development.
- As a consequence of restrictions placed upon him by his day care situation the child was unhappy.
- Nursery school supervision was lax and one parent stated her child had been hit by a staff member.
- Most felt the cost was excessive for the services rendered.
- There was no educational content in the day care arrangement.
- The child did not mix with children with different backgrounds.
- The parent had to rush home from work to pick-up the child.

In discussing the KLH program, the parents were very enthusiastic and lavish in their praise. The following evaluations were common:

- The child was happier at KLH than before.
- The child appeared to be learning faster.
- The parents were very impressed with the high quality of the supervision of the children.

- The children from non-English speaking homes were learning English.
- The lunch provided the children was superior to that received under prior child day care arrangements.
- Seven of the eleven parents stated that the child wanted to go to the Center on Saturday and Sunday.
- The services were better and cheaper than prior child care arrangements.
- The greater interaction of their children with other children was beneficial.
- The Center is a more stable arrangement and environment than the previous day care arrangement.

However, there was also some discontent related to the parents experience with the Child Development Center. This discontent was primarily caused by the early starting time and by transportation difficulties. All of the interviewees expressed concern over the early hour at which the child must be awakened. Further, Table IX shows that five parents utilized public transportation. These parents were concerned over the inconvenience of:

- Waking the child between 5:30 and 6:00 a.m.
- The time involved in getting to work on a crowded bus or subway where seats were not always available.
- The early start, crowded bus and lack of seats sometimes made the child ill-mannered and difficult to handle to and from work.

Several parents using public transportation indicated that on cold or inclement days they would rather leave their child with a neighbor than go through a 45 minute ordeal on one or two buses to get the child to the Center.

Summary

Since all the enrolled parents were working at KLH before the Center began its pilot study, the Center was not a key element in their decision to go to work. Many of the participants have strong family situations and a history of continuous employment. However, in contrast, at least three of the participating parents have either a history of welfare dependency, sporadic employment, or unstable family situations. None of these participants indicated they would discontinue working if the Center closed or was unavailable. However, they did indicate they would find it harder to continue at work because of this constant difficulty of finding and maintaining acceptable day care arrangements. Under these conditions they predicted their personal and work situation may deteriorate.

All of the parents interviewed felt the Center's day care fee was fair. A common comment was: "You can't feed a kid for $5 a week--let alone educate him."

It appears that despite temporary facilities and several shifts in location during the pilot study period, the participating mothers found the program attractive. They particularly liked its educational, nutritional and social aspects. The major problem was bringing children to the Center. Nevertheless, from the parents' point of view, this personal cost was bearable as long as their children received incremental benefits beyond those gained by alternative day care arrangements.

IV. MAJOR DECISIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

Between July 1965 and April 1969 those responsible for the establishment and the management of the Child Development Center at KLH made a number of major decisions which shaped the character of the Center and its relationships with parents, students, staff, community and KLH. Each of these decisions represented answers to issues raised by the parties involved. Many of the earlier decisions were apparently based on a strong desire on the part of the President of the Company and his wife to demonstrate a social philosophy shared by them. Other decisions were forced upon the Center by circumstances beyond its control, while still others were consciously made freely and objectively after an exhaustive study of the available facts.

This section will list the issues faced by the Center, present the decisions reached in each case, and describe the rationale leading to these decisions. In addition, the principal lessons learned by KLH from their successful and unsuccessful experiences, from which others seeking to replicate the Child Development Center might learn, are presented.

Why a Program?

The KLH Research and Development Corporation has always followed a policy of hiring at non-exploitive wages as much as possible from groups who have difficulties finding jobs - members of disadvantaged groups, people with little formal education, rehabilitated citizens, and welfare mothers of pre-school and school age children. In the early sixties the company's top management became aware through its close involvement with its plant employees that a number of working mothers at KLH and in the

Cambridge area were finding it difficult to go to work and hold jobs because of the lack of adequate day care facilities. In many cases these mothers needed to work because welfare provided inadequate support for them and their families.

As the work force expanded, management became increasingly concerned for the children of its working mothers. It was management's belief that unless adequate day care facilities could be provided many of these mothers would be forced to return to a welfare status. Alternatively, if they continued to work, their children might be immeasurably damaged through inadequate child care arrangements. In either case it was felt that there was a strong possibility that the children of these welfare working mothers might themselves grow up to become unemployable. Given the considerable efforts of the company to rehabilitate unemployable people, it was obvious to management that much of this work might be wasted if parents could not accept and hold jobs because of day care difficulties.

In a 1965 survey (participated in by KLH) of day care facilities in the Cambridge area, the Cambridge Community Services found that:

(1) There was a definite need in Cambridge for day care services, especially non-profit day care.

(2) Existing day care facilities were inadequate.

Through KLH's contacts with community officials and management's intimate knowledge of community plans and funding problems the KLH management confirmed that this lack of adequate day care in the Cambridge community would persist.

Since a segment of the company's work force was drawn from the greater Boston metropolitan area, a review of other communities' day care plans was

made. These plans indicated that the situation in Cambridge was also typical of the surrounding areas. The prospects for a significant increase in the availability of good day care in the Boston metropolitan area were dim.

In the Fall of 1965, the company was to hire 70 additional workers. This need provided management with the opportunity to reduce poverty in the Boston area by hiring women from welfare rolls. So that these mothers would be able to accept employment knowing that good day care arrangements would be available, it was decided in the Spring of 1965 to explore ways to tie a day care program in with the company's employment and training programs. Mrs. Morgan, the wife of the company's president, took on the task of developing the proposal to achieve this goal.

The company knew that a number of difficulties existed that might adversely affect this effort:

- Difficulty in getting a program of metropolitan scope funded when administration of funds under most legislation was set up along local jurisdictional lines, and when social planners were concentrating on neighborhood improvement.
- Friction among various government and private agencies, resulting in a fragmenting of approaches when several departments or agencies were concerned with different aspects of the same task.
- Interdisciplinary professional rivalries.
- The company knew its program would be criticized by those who believed:

    (a) maternal deprivation results when mothers are separated for any period of time from their children;

(b) all jobs should be reserved for men; women belong in the home.

(c) poor people, especially those on welfare, are responsible for their own poverty, which then is a just punishment.

(d) people have no right to subsidized day care if they are not poor, and they could not be poor because they have jobs;

(e) professionals caring for children are a threat to natural motherhood;

(f) group care for children leads to regimentation;

(g) employment for poor mothers with small children is a form of exploitation. Society should pay these mothers to stay home and be full-time mothers;

(h) business involvement in child care is undesirable because business is either paternalistic or profit-seeking at the expense of human beings.

Despite the difficulties outlined above, the company went ahead with its plans believing that people should deal with society as it is, not as they would like it to be, and work toward providing greater diversity and richness of choice for parents and their children. It was hoped that the proposed day care center would contribute to this end.

What Kind of a Program?

One of Mrs. Morgan's opinions was that the day care program should provide high quality education, despite the fact that an educationally-oriented program would be more expensive to operate than a baby-sitting type program. It was believed by Mrs. Morgan that there was a lack of public acceptance of realistic per pupil costs for programs of good educational and service quality as well as a lack of good cost data on existing programs of this type. She hoped to use the program to determine these costs and to demonstrate the advantage of such programs for the parents and children involved.

In Mrs. Morgan's opinion the incremental benefit from a high quality educationally-oriented day care program far outweighed the incremental costs of a qualified teaching staff. These benefits were of two kinds. First, the parents of disadvantaged children feel quality education for their children is essential if they are to move into the more advantaged segment of society. Therefore, the KLH program should be more successful in attracting working mothers than other day care programs if it meets their children's educational needs. Second, high quality early education may prevent the need for later remedial programs.

Mrs. Gwen Morgan, therefore, decided that the Executive Director of the Center should be a qualified early childhood educator and should be capable of assuming certain administrative responsibilities. A job description relating these two ingredients showed:

1. Qualifications

Master's degree in early childhood education or child development and appropriate work experience; or equivalent experience with a degree in a related field. Maturity and experience in working with children and with parents.

2. Responsibilities

The Executive Director shall, subject to the supervision of the Board of Trustees, manage and coordinate the activities of the Corporation between meetings of the Board of Trustees; moreover, the Director shall have such other powers and duties as the Trustees may from time to time determine.

The Director shall have responsibility for the overall coordination of every aspect of the Center's program. The duties of the Director fall into three main categories: <u>administrative</u>, <u>program</u> and <u>general</u> (working

with parents and consultants).

a. Administrative

Prepare budget in cooperation with Treasurer and Accountant

To recruit, hire and dismiss staff in consultation with the Personnel Practices Committee.

To maintain (in conjunction with Family Consultant and Head Teacher) cumulative records on each child and other aspects of the program

To establish and maintain working relations with the industry

To represent the Center in the community

To allocate various responsibilities to appropriate staff members.

b. Program

To be responsible for the integration and supervision of the educational program within the Center

To participate in the intake procedures, or delegate this responsibility to another staff member.

To establish direction for Center's educational philosophy and curriculum

To supervise (in conjunction with Head Teacher) teaching staff

To organize and supervise in-service training of staff

To substitute in classrooms when necessary

To order Center's supplies

c. General (Working with parents and consultants)

The development of significant parent interest and involvement in the program is a major objective, therefore, much of the Director's attention shall focus on:

Interpretation of Center's program to parents

Encouraging parents to visit the Center, to participate on Board committees and to become members of the Board of Trustees.

Keeping Corporation, Board members, consultants and Research Team informed of Center's progress.

3. Salary Range

The Executive Director's salary should be considered apart from that of other staff members and in relation to responsibilities, work load, size of staff, agency activity, and budgetary planning. The President and Treasurer of the Board should be responsible for reviewing the Director's salary each year and recommending the level of compensation to be established with the approval of the Board.

The inclusion of a full-time social worker on the staff was another important decision which determined the character of the program. This decision was based upon a request by the Children's Bureau that a full-time social worker be substituted for Mrs. Morgan's original plan for a part-time Psychological Consultant who would perform individualized program planning.

The function of the social worker on the Center's staff was to be as follows:

- Communicate to parents the value of a structured pre-school educational environment.
- Where possible, counsel parents on family problems through home visits so that adjustments can be made by staff and parents on an individual basis. This fosters maximum benefits from the program to both parent and child.
- In general, act as a liaison between parent, school and child on daily matters.
- Relate families using the school program with outside social service agencies.

The lower age of children to be served by the group care program was determined by two factors, one of which was beyond the control of the Center.

First, in 1965 Massachusetts did not ordinarily permit two-year olds in group care. Second, the decision to serve children 2-6½ was made in order to have a core group center around which later to plan and to build other services for younger and older children, as well as satellite services for other pre-school children.

The upper age limit of 6½ years was determined by the Massachusetts requirement that the cities and towns provide compulsory educational services beginning with the first grade level. Since a number of Boston communities did not provide kindergarten services, working mothers were often forced to provide day care facilities for their children up to the age of 6½ years.

How Big a Program?

The projected size of the Center from the time of the earliest planning was 60 children. This figure was not based upon any formal quantitative survey of the needs of the KLH working mothers or the working mothers in the Cambridge community, except for a survey done by Cambridge Community Services. The decision not to undertake a formal survey to determine a proper size reflected the company's approach at the time to product development. The top management group strongly believed that the results of market research which sought consumer reactions to products the consumer was unfamiliar with in most cases could not be relied upon. In addition, until funding for the Center was assured management did not wish to create expectations among the workers which subsequently would not be realized if a day care program did not come into being. Therefore, the management preferred to rely upon their own experience, analysis of the situation and intuition.

There were several reasons for settling on an enrollment of 60. First, the Head Start model suggested that this was an appropriate size for educationally-oriented group day care programs. Second, the planners felt that at this level the cost per student would be more acceptable than for a program with a smaller enrollment but with nearly the same total fixed costs and investment requirements. Third, if in the Fall of 1965 the company hired 70 workers, many of these people would be women so therefore a need for day care would exist among the KLH workers. This additional need, plus the already existing need among current KLH workers was estimated to call for a program serving 40 to 60 children. Furthermore, it was anticipated that vacant places not taken by children of KLH parents would be filled easily by children of non-KLH working mothers living or working in the KLH plant area.

The Center has been accused of being over-ambitious in its enrollment plans. Some have suggested the demand for the program among KLH parents is not very strong or extensive, certainly it is nowhere near 60 children. Others have criticized the Center for being too restrictive in that it would limit enrollment only to KLH related children. Most of these critics, however, have overlooked the fact that the Center was originally conceived as a Cambridge community project, incorporating the notion that employees of KLH, irrespective of where they lived, were part of that community. Thus, while the Center would be primarily for KLH employees, it would not be inconsistent to enroll the children of non-KLH working mothers if all of the places were not taken by the children of KLH employees.

Mrs. Morgan explained why the Center would give preference to the children of KLH employees:

It was expected that the Center would begin with a few children and would grow incrementally to meet needs, creating its own demand as it went along. It is obvious that the Center could not meet the social needs of all of Cambridge, unless substantially funded. The plan was to meet the needs closest at hand before meeting needs elsewhere.

The child care project is an example of business doing its thing. Employment is one of the important services which KLH offers the community, as part of its own operations. The child care project is offered along with employment opportunity, for those who need both. Yet there is an underlying assumption, only half-recognized, on the part of many in the social service fields that if KLH were <u>really</u> interested in serving the community, it would provide the child care to people who do not work at KLH, as if people cease to be members of the community upon being hired at KLH. This attitude does not recognize the search on the part of the business for a synergic solution, or one which both helps people and contributes to profit. Furthermore, it overlooks the meaning of the project itself in combining job opportunity with child care.

Two recent academic plans are worth attention. Brandeis University offered to expand its nursery school to take in community people. This would parallel the expectations described above regarding the KLH project. Jackson College, on the other hand, is setting up a child care center which will serve the children of women whom Jackson hopes to enroll in adult education projects, many of these women with much formal education. The Jackson project seems to me more far-reaching than the Brandeis one, because it coordinates two services which Jackson can offer.

The project at KLH parallels the one at Jackson, in that both KLH and Jackson are offering their specialty along with the child care. It would be rather silly for KLH to set up a center for the community and take in children whose families do not need the employment, while turning down families who do. It would be foolish to offer employment to women and allow them to use makeshift harmful arrangements for their children, while contributing child care for other families. A service without the employment tie-in can be better offered by some other group in the community.

A survey of the KLH work force in October-November, 1967 indicated that it was unlikely that the Center would enroll 60 children of KLH parents on its opening day, but this had never been expected or intended. The original plan had been to enroll children on a stepped basis from among KLH employees, new employees, and others if necessary to reach full enrollment in one year.

Interviews conducted (by the original research team) with 76 employees or approximately 13% of the 1967 work force indicated:

(a) 32.5% of the work force lived in the Roxbury-Dorchester-South End district of Boston, generally recognized as a hard-core poverty area which contains the Negro ghetto.

(b) Over 25% of the women were either separated or divorced and an additional 11% were widowed. Only 12% of the men were separated or divorced.

(c) Over 29% of the women employees were mothers of children under 16, however, less than 5½% were mothers of children under 6 years of age.

(d) On the basis of the survey, it was projected that of mothers then employed at KLH, a maximum of 30 children, aged 2½ to 6, would be eligible on the basis of age for admittance to the KLH Child Development Center.

(e) None of the mothers interviewed who had children under 6 expressed any concern or worry regarding the existing child care arrangement for their pre-schoolers. These arrangements included purchase of full time care out-of-home and a combination of out-of-home care and nursery school.

(f) Approximately 57% of the mothers with children 6 through 15 expressed concern and worry about the child care or lack of child care arrangements for their children. The time period from end of the school day until the time mother arrives home was an unsupervised time for most of the children and was the source of concern most frequently mentioned by this group of mothers. The projected number of children falling into this category for the KLH work force at large was in excess of 100.

(g) Approximately 60% of the children whose fathers were employed at KLH were under 6 years of age. However, almost all of these children were cared for at home by their mothers or a live-in relative and in almost all instances their care was not regarded as problematical.

The present research team conducted interviews in 1968 with all past and present participating parents. These interviews (although only a very limited sample) showed some discrepancies between personnel records and actual circumstances. Discussions with people in the Company's Personnel Department suggested that employees do not always supply accurate informa-

tion. Understandably, working mothers may fear that their probability of being hired could be affected. Therefore, sometimes they do not admit to having day care problems or even having small children at home.

The current research team conducted a second survey in January, 1969 which was supported by the Center and KLH. (See detailed results in Appendix B). Based upon responses by 385 plant workers and 92 office and management personnel (out of a total employee group of nearly 700) to a one-page questionnaire, the survey indicated:

- In addition to the parents and children already enrolled, at least eighty-seven (87) other parents employed by the corporation had collectively one hundred and twenty-nine (129) children six years of age and under. One hundred and one (101) of these children were between two and six years of age.*
- Beyond the group already enrolled, nineteen (19) additional parents with twenty-one (21) children between two and six years of age indicated they would probably participate in the Center when it moved to its new quarters. This group of parents also had eleven (11) children under two years of age.
- Fifty-six (56) parents with twenty-nine (29) children under two years of age and with sixty-three (63) children between two and six years of age said they would not participate in the program. This group included all of the eligible clerical and management parents.
- The present child care arrangements of the sixty-two (62) parents in the factory group and the twenty-five (25) parents in the clerical and management group were as follows:

*The survey results are not extrapolated for the total employee group.

	Plant Group		Clerical & Management	
	Will Participate	Will Not Participate	Will Participate	Will Not Participate
	(All figures given in per cents)			
Wife	-	-	80	100
Relative or Neighbor in Child's Home	64	65	20	-
Relative or Neighbor away from Home	36	32	-	-
Nursery or Day Care	-	3	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-
	100%	100%	100%	100%

- The cost of weekly child care per child to thirty-seven (37) factory workers with children under six years of age who did not stay with a wife or husband during the day was as follows: less than $10 (5); $10-$14 (15); $15-$20 (17).
- The respondents with children under six years of age evaluated their day care arrangements as follows:

	Plant Group		Clerical & Management	
	Will Participate	Will Not Participate	Will Participate	Will Not Participate
	(All figures given in per cents)			
Satisfactory	71.5	100	100	100
Unsatisfactory	28.5	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%

- The eligible parents lived in the following towns:

	Plant Group		Clerical & Management	
	Will Participate	Will Not Participate	Will Participate	Will Not Participate
	(All figures given in per cents)			
Boston	7	10	-	-
Roxbury	14	5	-	-
S. Boston/Dorchester	7	28	-	-
Cambridge/Somerville	58	39	20	-
Other	14	18	80	94
	100%	100%	100%	100%

The labor grades (Grade 10 starts paying at $1.90 per hours. Grade 3 is a supervisory grade paying about $100 per week.) of the eligible plant work group were as follows:

	Plant Group	
	Will Participate	Will Not Participate
	(All figures given in per cents)	
Grade 10	7	8
9	15	54
8	28	20
7	28	9
6	-	-
5	22	-
4	-	3
3	-	-
2	-	3
1	-	3
	100%	100%

The Distribution of the length of employment of the eligible parents with children six years of age and younger was:

	Plant Group		Clerical & Management	
	Will Participate	Will Not Participate	Will Participate	Will Not Participate
Less than 1 year	29	44	40	29
1 - 2 years	-	-	20	29
2 - 3 years	29	17	-	-
3 - 4 years	7	8	-	13
4 - 5 years	21	19	40	29
5 - 6 years	7	6	-	-
6 - 7 years	7	3	3	-
7 - 8 years	-	3	3	-
8+ years	-	-	-	-

An analysis of the sex of the eligible parents with children six years of age or under showed:

	Plant Group		Clerical & Management	
	Will Participate	Will Not Participate	Will Participate	Will Not Participate
	(All figures given in per cents)			
Male	19.0	22.5	18	77
Female	7.5	51.0	5	-
	26.5%	73.5%	23%	77%

The comparative transportation statistics for the eligible parent were:

	Plant Group		Clerical & Management	
	Will Participate	Will Not Participate	Will Participate	Will Not Participate
	(All figures given in per cents)			
Bus/Subway	43	46	-	6
Own Car	43	36	60	88
Car Pool	-	8	-	-
Walk	7	10	20	-
Other	7	-	20	6
	100%	100%	100%	100%

The one-way travel time statistics for the eligible parents were:

	Plant Group		Clerical & Management	
	Will Participate	Will Not Participate	Will Participate	Will Not Participate
	(All figures given in per cents)			
15 minutes or less	43	23	-	5.5
16-20 minutes	21	18	20	-
21-30 minutes	29	36	40	47.5
31-45 minutes	-	13	20	23.5
Over 45 minutes	7	10	20	23.5
	100%	100%	100%	100%

A number of factors should be kept in mind when reviewing survey results. First, a large number of the type workers employed by KLH can only comprehend and deal effectively with low level abstractions. Thus, until they see the actual day care physical plant and program in action, they find it difficult to respond to the question of whether or not they would enroll eligible children. In the face of having to decide between a known day care arrangement and an uncertain alternative which they cannot comprehend they tend to favor the known alternative. If this observation

is valid, it may explain the difference between the responses to the 1967 survey, which showed no interest in a day care program, and the 1969 survey, which indicated some interest. By the time the second survey was conducted the pilot program had been in operation six months, but not at a site near the plant.

Since the second survey the new site, now operational, has been visited by virtually every KLH employee as part of the Company's program to increase its visibility to its employee group. At least three eligible parents, who at the time of the 1969 survey had indicated no interest in the Center, have since applied for admission after seeing the permanent facilities and the program in action.

Second, as much as 20 per cent of the work force cannot speak nor read English very well. As a result, their responses to interview questions or questionnaires in English may not be very reliable.

Third, the company was expanding its work force and some of the users of the Center would be from this new group of employees. The availability of the Center might influence mothers with small children who might not otherwise apply for work to do so. Evidence supporting this belief is seen in the enrollment of five children of new employees in the program during April and May, 1969.

Mrs. Morgan offered a fourth reason for underenrollment which we consider extremely enlightening. She stated in an interview that it is a common experience for most day care centers to be under-enrolled during their first two or three years, even when surveys have been taken and need has been indicated. She added, "This is not surprising. Obviously the parents with children in the 3-4 year old age range who need day care have

already made other arrangements for their children. Those children born after the center is known to be an available service to the community, are enrolled in it, and there is usually a sharp increase in the third year or so, resulting in a long waiting list. This factor is known to those who are familiar with day care, and it was anticipated in planning this project."

The research team believes that the 1967 and 1969 survey results were probably misleading in that they underestimated the potential demand for the Center. Nevertheless, we believe that reliable demand surveys can and should be used by those contemplating the establishment of work-related day care programs.

How to Fund?

Preliminary budgets developed during the planning stage indicated the per student weekly cost would be at least $25 for a program of acceptable quality. This figure was beyond the corporation's ability to pay, even if the parents paid some tuition. Therefore, since the education and custodial services provided the children would benefit the community, the company decided to look for a cooperative funding arrangement.

Mrs. Gwen Morgan devoted nearly two years developing the proposal for a high quality industry-related child care facility and seeking the necessary funds for such a program. Mrs. Morgan's search for funds included the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee, Action for Boston Community Development, U.S. Department of Labor, Ford Foundation, Department of Housing and Urban Development and the U.S. Children's Bureau.

Eventually, the Children's Bureau accepted Mrs. Morgan's proposal and offered to support the development of a comprehensive child development

center at KLH as a demonstration project. The requirements imposed on KLH were that they (1) establish an independent non-profit corporation to sponsor the project, and (2) accept an independent evaluation by a competent university-based research team selected by the Children's Bureau. The KLH Research and Development Corporation agreed to these terms and the Children's Bureau contracted with a research team to perform the evaluation of the project. These requirements were acceptable to the company since it had always been their intention to operate the Center as a non-profit corporation. Further, Mrs. Morgan's proposals had already anticipated using the Center for research purposes. Accordingly, the KLH Child Development Center was established and the project was funded for the fiscal year 1967-1968.

Within a few months of the Center's first fiscal year some problems developed between the Center's staff and KLH and the research team. The research team operated through a direct contract with the Children's Bureau.* Both groups contended that the other had failed to fulfill its responsibilities as specified in the original proposal. The culmination of the misunderstandings between the two groups occurred on November 24, 1967 when the KLH Child Development Center Board voted unanimously to sever its connection with the research team. The Children's Bureau, in turn, temporarily withdrew the funds for the project.

Subsequently, the Children's Bureau investigated the matter and determined that the project still represented a viable child care program and funds were released to continue the demonstration phase for the fiscal year 1968-1969.

---

*See: Evaluation of KLH Child Development Center, Progress Report, by Gil, D.G. and Hoffman, H.J., Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts, April, 1968.

When the decision to refund the program for the fiscal year 1968-1969 was made the method of selecting a research team was changed. The Children's Bureau granted the KLH Center the right to choose the research team which would evaluate the project. This time the research contract was to be between the research team and the Center, rather than directly between the research team and the Children's Bureau. The Center selected a team from the Social Administration Research Institute. There were $34,107 of unused research funds from the prior year, $23,500 of which was to pay the research team for the new fiscal year.

The Children's Bureau funding of the Child Development Center was for operating expenditures only. Therefore, the Center had to seek other funds to cover the costs of renovating the Lansdowne Street building. The most promising additional sources of funds were from foundations and individuals. However, it soon became clear to the Board of Trustees that before donors would make grants to the Center it would have to be classified as a tax-exempt corporation so that grants would be tax deductible as charitable contributions.

In April, 1967, when the KLH Child Development Center was founded as a non-profit corporation, consideration was given by the planning staff and Board of Trustees to obtaining a tax-exempt number from the Internal Revenue Service. They believed that the Center as a non-profit organization would have no difficulty in being declared tax-exempt. Apparently, however, there was little follow through on this matter. Nobody was alarmed, since it was commonly felt that tax-exempt approval would be a mere formality requiring application to the Internal Revenue Service and automatic approval.

After the budget request to the Children's Bureau for the fiscal year 1968-1969 was approved, the need for the tax-exempt status became more pressing. Accordingly, in July, 1968, the Board Chairman, Dr. Sam Braun and the Clerk of the Board initiated action with the Boston Office of the Internal Revenue Service. The Boston office informed the Center that a tax-exempt determination must come from the Washington office and the case was forwarded there for a decision.

In August, 1968, to the surprise of the staff, the Internal Revenue Service expressed some reservations about granting a tax-exempt status to the Center. The Internal Revenue Service questioned the Center's eligibility for tax-exempt status for the following reasons:

(1) It was unclear to the examiners whether the Center was educational in nature or merely a baby-sitting service.

(2) The Center was intended to service low-income and welfare families yet would accept children from middle-income parents in management ranks.

(3) The Child Care Center was actually a benefit to the KLH Research and Development Corporation and not to the community. It represented a fringe-benefit to the employees which enhanced the company's ability to recruit employees and to compete more favorably in its product market.

The Center answered the first objection by providing the Internal Revenue Service with the qualifications of the staff and a statement of the original objectives of the program. The staff qualifications were as follows: The Director possessed a Master's Degree in Education and has had work experience in child education; the Assistant Director was an educationally qualified

social worker whose duties would be of a social work nature; the teachers were college graduates, also qualified in education; the teacher's aids were to be trained at the Center in a pilot program which was intended to provide future teachers and assistant teachers for the KLH project and other pre-school day care centers. It was also explained to the IRS that from its inception the program was designed to be educational and that this goal was incorporated in the proposal accepted by the Children's Bureau.

In reply to the IRS's second objection, the Chairman of the Center's Board of Trustees, stated that the Center was intended primarily to service the children from low-income and/or from welfare families. He added, however, one of the principal educational objectives of the program was that disadvantaged children be exposed to, and interact with, children from more culturally advantaged socio-economic backgrounds. This interaction was intended to provide the poorer child with the insights of children with possibly more varied experiences, thus engendering greater creativity and awareness in the poorer child.

The Board Chairman also emphasized that selection of the students for the program was made by the Center's staff and not by the KLH Research and Development Corp. The KLH company had no authority and has indeed refrained from exerting any influence in pupil selection.

In answer to the third objection that the Center represents a company benefit and not a community benefit, the Board Chairman contended that the Center was "owned" and controlled by the children's parents and that it primarily served welfare and low-income persons. As a result the use of the Center obviated the need for these persons to be on the welfare rolls. It was mentioned that it was the hope of the Center's Board of Trustees

that through its health and educational programs the need for remedial programs later in the lives of the participating pupils would be reduced. The anticipated community benefits to be derived were also explained in detail.

A tax decision favorable to the Center was crucial to its continued existence and possibly to the existence and creation of other industry-based day care centers. Renovation costs for the program's permanent building at 38 Lansdowne Street were expected to be between 40 and 50 thousand dollars. As of April 30, 1969, nearly $36,000 had been spent on renovations, but all work on the building had ceased because of a lack of funds, pending the tax ruling. A guaranteed grant of $25,000 from the W.T. Grant Foundation and a $5,000 grant from the Dorrit Day Care Center were being held up pending a favorable ruling by the Internal Revenue Service. In addition, the former president of KLH, Mr. Morgan, had contributed $31,000 during 1968. Fortunately, on April 18, 1969 the Center was granted a tax-exempt status.

Another important source of assistance to the Center was the various in-kind services provided by KLH. The value of these direct and indirect services has been estimated by company management to be as high as $50,000. However, this figure cannot be verified since extensive records of in-kind services have not been kept by either the Corporation or the Center.

The current Children's Bureau grant expires on June 30, 1970. As of May, 1969, the problem of how to fund the Center after June 30, 1970 had not been resolved.

Should the Center be Independent?

The management of the KLH Research and Development Corporation decided that the Day Care Center should be a non-profit corporation established and

managed independent of KLH for the following reasons:

- The company was not sure that it could afford to maintain the Center.
- In order to get outside funding from the government, foundations, and individuals it was necessary that the Center be an independent, non-profit tax-exempt corporation.
- The company did not want the Center to be considered a fringe benefit and as such subject to union negotiations.
- It was considered discriminatory by management to offer a special service to one particular group of employees. This would not be in accord with the company's policy of non-discriminatory employee practices.
- It may prove to be very difficult for all concerned if parents working for KLH were asked to control a company operated program.
- Some social scientists had expressed a fear that business would interfere in the industry-related day care's professional areas to the detriment of the program. The company wished to avoid having such a situation arise.

Accordingly, the company has maintained a loose relationship with the day care program.

The most direct link between KLH and the Center has been the use of the "KLH" trademark by the Center and the presence of the company's controller on the Board of Trustees. Representation on the Board was not requested by KLH. The Center, through KLH's controller, however, has received much needed help with its bookkeeping system and financial controls. The company controller was an early backer of the day care center and had contributed his time to its development out of a personal interest in the

project. He was a logical choice for a Board member.

The decision to use the company trademark, "KLH", in naming the Center was made by the Center's President. This decision could have been considered by KLH as a possible infringement. It could have also been misinterpreted by the community as a publicity gimmick. These questions did not trouble the company officers, however, as they viewed the center as part of the "KLH community." It was appropriate to use the KLH trademark in its name even though the Center was a separate, independently controlled company.

Despite the fact that the Center is legally independent of the Corporation, the use of the "KLH" name, the widespread publicity about the Center, and the priority given to KLH employees could possibly create an embarrassing situation for KLH should the Center close for lack of adequate financing. Management is aware of this possibility as they are also aware of the fact that the company cannot alone finance the Center. A satisfactory solution to this potential dilemma has not yet been devised.

Who is to Control the Center?

The planners of the child care center spent a considerable amount of time planning the kind of Board that was most suitable for the KLH Child Development Center. Their decision was made knowing the company did not want to make important policy decisions and that the government needed to deal with a non-profit organization. They were also anxious to have the formality of an independent corporation controlled by parents.

Since the Center was a new kind of organization its planners found no readily available model for achieving parent control and participation. After reviewing the experiences of parent participation in public schools, cooperative nursery schools, private charitable organizations and community

action boards, the planners decided that the steps toward parent control should be taken through a developmental process. Parents should accumulate experience at many levels: individual contributions, committees, Board memberships, and corporate meetings. It was believed these roles for parents would eventually add up to the experience of participation and control.

The planners developed the following guidelines for deciding which Board model was appropriate:

- The Board members should not be figureheads, protected from reality by their professional staff. It was felt parents would not participate on this basis.
- Board members should have working roles with committees working under them. The planners believed that this approach had the advantage of giving parents real responsibility, rather than trying to provide some kind of make-work in order to have parents feel involved. It was thought that working parents would not accept any insincere attempts to involve them. Rather, they would participate if they believed their efforts could reduce the operating costs of the Center and if their experience as working parents would be clearly incorporated in the Center's plans.
- The Executive Director should determine those areas where she would like to supplement the staff's work with parent participation, and those areas she wanted to keep entirely to the province of the professional staff. The way in which the Executive Director wanted to operate would influence the eventual development of Board roles and the talent represented on the Board. Therefore, the planners believed that it was important to involve the Director in the planning and manning of the Board.

- The Board should build a real sense of its legal role. The planners believed this was important because of the many different groups which would impinge on the Center's activities, such as the parents, the corporation, the staff, the research team and the Children's Bureau. Once operations begin it would be necessary to make clear the distinctions between the roles of these different groups so that they could deal with one another in clearly defined and well understood roles. It was felt this was particularly important if the Board was to be differentiated from the KLH Research and Development Corporation. When the Board asked the corporation for assistance, it should be clear that this was one independent group requesting the services of another.

- The Board Chairman should be capable of starting and ending a meeting on time: moving through a long, complicated agenda without having the participants feel manipulated or controlled by a tight organization: and, giving the participants a feeling that their time has not been wasted in aimless discussion. This quality in the Chairman was specified since the planners believed working people, especially working parents, have limited time and have a right to resent anyone who wastes it. If capable people consider much of the Board discussions unnecessary, they will be reluctant to give their time to this activity. Also, while some people enjoy engaging in discussions which develop into a test of verbal skills, it was thought it would be unlikely that parents with limited education would appreciate this practice.

. The membership of the Board should not be limited to one economic stratum. Since the Center planned to make its services available to all of the corporation's employees, the planners believed its control should be in the hands of all parents irrespective of their income level.

. In writing its by-laws, the Center should regard whatever Board model it adopts as being experimental. Since no blueprint existed for a parent-controlled Board in an industry-related day care situation, it was expected that the most appropriate model could be identified better after operating experience was gained, rather than by planning for an uncertain and unknown project.

. While the Center was interested in supporting evaluative research of its activities, the Board should maintain a concern for the total project. The planners were interested in having the practice of a parent-controlled Board researched, but they were also mindful of the fact the Board was a legal body with a total program responsibility. Therefore, while it could be observed by research people it must not be manipulated like a laboratory artifact. It had to remain responsible for the process it had set underway through its decisions.

Using the planner's guidelines, the incorporators decided that:

. There be nine trustees.

. The Executive Director of the Center be given a vote on the Board of Trustees.

. The Board members be drawn from the Cambridge community and from KLH.

- Key management people of KLH be excluded from the Board.
- The structure of the corporation would include all enrolled parents.

The Executive Director of the program was given a vote to protect the professional area and to give the staff a sense of wider participation in the Center's affairs. The incorporators did not believe in parent control as an end in itself. Rather, through this structure they hoped to see how far it was possible to develop a genuine parent-professional feeling of shared responsibility for the care of children. The incorporators' decisions which became part of the Center's by-laws raised several problems:

- If the parents are KLH employees, how free of Company domination can such a Board be?
- If parents have legal control, might they not try to control the professional area and try to make decisions on professional aspects of the program?
- How can there be a parent Board before there are parents?

Since no children could be enrolled, the incorporators chose an interim Board which was to function until the program was operational. They believed that the interim Board should include potential parents, but in the incorporators' opinion it would be exploitive to ask busy working mothers to give very much of their time to the project before their children were enrolled. On the other hand, the planners and the incorporators also decided that styles of parent leadership and operating models should be developed to help the parents learn how to fill Board roles. This should be done as soon as possible so that the work force would not develop

the idea that the Board role--their future role in the Center--was not an essential one.

In order to avoid the potential difficulty of strong feelings entering into parent-teacher relations and creating problems for the staff in program development, it was decided to appoint an interim Board that would establish as a precedent the necessary respect for the professional areas.

In addition, in order to develop a degree of community feeling it was decided that every member of the interim Board should have in common some past or present connection with KLH. Despite the possible effects of such a decision it was felt that a common bond would be more beneficial for the Center in the long run.

An alternative approach to manning the interim Board would have been to select professional people and distinguished citizens who were friends of the founders and sympathetic to the project's goals. This approach was rejected in preference to the one taken. According to Mrs. Morgan, there were a number of reasons:

> First, people with a connection with KLH would have as part of their experience the company's ten year's experience with an intercultural urban work force. Their background understanding of the kind of people who work at KLH, and their tradition of working comfortably together, both on the job and in non-employment situations, such as sports, and volunteer work, would be something another type of Board would lack and would not be likely to learn right away.
>
> Second, if it is ever going to be possible to separate a parent Board within KLH from the company, it seemed important to start doing it in the beginning. Any organization sets its directions from its beginnings until the first major organizational upheaval. A KLH Board would be recognized as such by KLH workers throughout the company; and if carefully chosen so that it was not a group of "company stooges" -- which would be immediately apparent to the workers -- these first Board members could be used as models and could make a transition to parent control. A more traditional type of Board could not as easily make this transition.

> Third, even though such a plan was unusual, it seemed worth trying as an aspect of a value in industry-government cooperation. In a partnership, the industry would contribute more than money. Setting up a conventional academic program within an industrial setting, which was suspicious of the industry and protected itself from it, would lose the potential values which we saw in this project. People having had some experience in the industry would understand the business situation, and would understand what is possible and what is not possible to expect of the industry and how to make use of the industry within its own framework.

The interim Board as eventually selected consisted of: three parent-employees; the controller of the Corporation; a founder of KLH who was no longer connected with the company; a member of the KLH personnel department; and Mrs. Morgan, who agreed to serve as the first president of the Center for one year. As previously indicated, the controller of KLH company was selected by the incorporators because they felt his talent was needed in setting up the Center's bookkeeping system and financial controls. He was not considered to be a representative of the company.

Mrs. Morgan explained why she accepted the Presidency:

> I agreed to serve as the first President, knowing that I have a serious handicap to overcome in being married to the company President, which will in the long run limit my usefulness. I also knew that my role could be misunderstood by those who do not understand or share our goals. However, it seemed important that someone with knowledge and past experience in this kind of Board be its first president in order to establish the desired role for the guidance of future Boards.
>
> At the risk of sounding facetious, I would say that one good way to avoid company control is to put the President's wife on the Board. With the help of the Executive Director and the advice of our consultant on professional affairs, Mrs. Laura Morris, I felt confident that I could overcome this handicap. My husband and I have for many years operated very comfortably in situations in which we filled different roles and represented different points of view. Those who work with us soon become aware that neither of us has either the ability or the desire to control the thought or action of the other; that we often differ; and that we have little time for conversation about our outside activities. It is probable that I was identified by the Board members at least as much as a pre-planner of this service, as I was known as the wife of the President.

During the Board's first year two major criticisms of it were raised by the earlier researchers. The first was that after one year of incorporation the Board had not moved very far toward parent control of the Center. The second, and related criticism, was that the Board President controlled "everything."

While there is no doubt Mrs. Morgan worked actively in all areas of the project and dominated its early history, it is the opinion of the research team that without her enthusiasm, imagination, energy and intimate knowledge of welfare issues, practices and theory, the Center most probably would not ever have been established. There were many very difficult problems to overcome in developing and funding this novel approach to child care for the working family. To date, the research team has not uncovered any evidence that, through Mrs. Morgan, the company controlled the Center.

At the first annual meeting of the KLH Child Development Center on May 19, 1968 Mrs. Morgan's term as President of the interim Board expired. She felt it was unfortunate that the incoming President of the Board inherited the two major developmental phase problems she had not solved: finding a building and raising money to renovate it. These two tasks, germane to any new project, small business, etc., requiring the leadership of an individual with a unique sense for commitment of time and energy in the early stages were ultimately accomplished when the Board elected as President, the capable Dr. Samuel J. Braun, an associate of the Cambridge Mental Health Center. The new Board represented a more traditional philanthropic Board structure, and a larger role for the Executive Director in determining the direction of the Center.

The new Board consisted of eleven members: three parents, four representatives of the community, three employees of KLH Research and Development Corporation and the Center's Executive Director. This new group took on the characteristics of a working board-committee, meeting at least once per month and sometimes, informally, about three times per month. Funds were raised, the building was renovated and the school was opened.

In retrospect, the present research has the opinion that if one has ambitions for opening an industry-based day care center, it is imperative to have highly motivated leadership and an actively working contingent. The KLH Child Development Center's life prevailed because of such active agents who labored for many hours without pecuniary embellishment.

The Board of Trustees, the staff of the Center and the Corporation have all been disappointed in their inability to interest parents in serving on the Board of Trustees. In May, 1969 only one parent was on the Board. The two other parents elected in May, 1968 had left their jobs at KLH. The Board intended to fill these vacancies with parents as soon as the resignations of the former Board members were obtained.

Even though the parents' representation on the Board has been limited, Board meetings have been open to all interested parents. On several occasions parents have attended the meetings, observed the proceedings and expressed a willingness to take a more active role once the Center was fully operational and in its permanent facilities.

One of the principal obstacles to parent participation in the once-a-month Board meetings was the time when meetings are held. Generally, the Board met late in the afternoon at a time which was not convenient for

parents who prefer, or find it necessary, to go straight home after work. One alternative would be for the corporation to return to the practice of giving parents who serve on the Board time off from work to attend meetings as had been done in the beginning. This approach, however, violates the spirit of an agreement made by the Center and KLH that the Center's activities would not interfere with production schedules and existing plant-employee relationships.

One decision that has increased parent participation in the management of the Center was the establishment of Board committees. In July, 1968, the Board decided that the 45-man Advisory Committee representing universities, public and private agencies and other professions was not intended to function as a body.* The Advisory Committee was originally established by the Center's planners and incorporators to provide expert advice during the planning and initial establishment of the Center.

The Board may, in the future set up a series of permanent committees chaired by Board members. Members of the Advisory Committee were told that committee chairmen may be individually called upon to serve as resource people at various meetings of the committees. Parents with children enrolled in the school would be asked to join committees of their choice. Other committee members included Board members, staff, and some non-parent members of the corporation.

In May, 1969, the committees set up by the Board were as follows:

. Admissions and Fees Committee. This committee consists of a parent as its chairman, two other parents (who are not board

*As individual members, the group had provided much valuable advice during the planning phase of the project.

members) and three members from the Board.

- Health Committee. The Health Committee has a KLH employee from the Personnel Department for its chairman. Other members are the company nurse, two parents, a representative from the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (resource person from the Advisory Committee) and the Assistant Commissioner of Public Health in Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Fund Raising Committee. This committee is chaired by a member of the Board from the community, a corporation member, and the President of the Board.
- Building Committee. This committee consists of two Board members.

The meetings of the Health Committee and the Admissions and Fees Committee were held during lunch and coffee breaks so that parents could participate. It was anticipated that a number of different proposals to encourage and facilitate greater parental involvement would be discussed at the annual meeting of the Center's incorporators on June 11, 1969.

When to Begin the Program?

After two years of planning the Center was funded by the Children's Bureau on July 1, 1967. A condition of this grant was that an independent research team would be retained by the Children's Bureau to evaluate the project. When the research team was selected it, in turn, insisted that certain conditions be met. Among these was the requirement that lead time of approximately one year should be provided prior to the implementation of the demonstration project. In their judgement, this time would enable senior program and research staff to develop jointly the specifications of program objectives and components, and the research design by means of which the effects of the specified program inputs were to be validly studied and measured.

The condition of the lead time of one year prior to the implementation of the demonstration project was not acceptable by KLH. In their eagerness to get the project operational the staff and trustees began planning to embark upon a pilot program as soon as possible. This action, as mentioned in another part of this report, ultimately led to freezing funds for the Center's project, displacement of the initial research team by a research team from Social Administration Research Institute, Inc., and replenishment of Federal funds.

The Trustees' approval of the decision to operate a pilot program was based upon at least six considerations:

1. They were concerned that the staff hired to develop and operate the program would lose interest if they were expected to spend their time in a childless Center so beset with difficulties.
2. The novel nature of the program made it wise to test ideas and gain experience before becoming fully operational.
3. The plant workers had expressed considerable interest in the program and might lose faith in the project unless results were shown soon after adequate funding was available.
4. KLH Research and Development Corp., had reason to expect some tangible results from their several years investment in this project.
5. The twelve-month lead time specified by the research team was unrealistically long.
6. The proposal by the Center to the Children's Bureau anticipated a service program would be in operation as soon as it was feasible.

7. It appeared that it would take considerable time to locate and renovate a permanent facility.

The wisdom of the decision to begin operations sooner than the initial research team proposed is not a researchable element. It is the opinion of the present research staff that no specified time horizon is applicable to all situations and personnel. There is no question, however, that some time must be provided to test the feasibility of the concept, to be assured that a demand exists or can be created, and to establish a plan delineating goals, resources required to achieve such goals, and strategies necessary to efficiently apply such resources.

Under the circumstances, we feel the Center chose wisely and history shows evidence of their success. Naturally, some errors were made but the learning experience of the personnel and documents such as this will surely diminish both lead time required and the magnitude of errors.

What Fees to Charge Parents?

The Board of Trustees adopted the recommendation of its President Mrs. Morgan that a school which is open to employees at all wage levels should adopt a sliding scale tuition. Mrs. Morgan supported her recommendation as follows.*

> A school which is open to employees at all levels and which charges a sliding scale tuition is recommended for the following reasons.
>
> Parent Involvement: Parent involvement in their children's education is an important goal of this pre-school project. If parents pay something, however small, they are likely to value the project more and become more involved in it. It will make sense to them to be expected to be members of the corporation and serve on the Board of Trustees, as well as participate in the program. Without tuition,

*KLH Child Development Center, Inc.: A Proposal to Establish a Work-Related Child Development Center; May, 1967; pg. 93-95.

the school might be regarded as an employee fringe benefit, or as something the government is doing for the children, neither of which attitudes makes the parents feel a necessary part of the process. Asking a nominal tuition seems a good way of avoiding paternalism, either of industry or of government, and of making the point from the beginning that the parents have an important role in the pre-school.

Future Funding: Every indication is that pre-schools are going to become not only important, but necessary in the nation to prevent educational handicaps, sub-cultural isolation, and in some cases emotional problems. Yet they are costly. Since this project has as a major aim the proliferation of similar pre-schools, it is important to look for a formula under which such schools can realistically be financed. It is not likely that a good school could be provided by a company for the benefit of its employees, or that it could support itself with tuition. A realistic formula some years from now may be a partnership between government agencies, either federal or state and local, the industrial company, and the parents, each paying about 1/3 of the total costs. Having tuition from the beginning will make the transition easier. A tuition-free project might be so costly that it would be abandoned, or the quality might suffer. Yet KLH workers have indicated a willingness to pay a nominal tuition, and since they are all employed, they are able to pay.

Incentive: A tuition-free school, since funds are limited, might be forced to meet demand by limiting itself to those least able to pay tuition. The effect would be to make this a "poverty" rather than an "anti-poverty" program. It would draw a sharp line in the company between those who are poor and eligible for the program and those who are not. Worst of all, an employee is encouraged not to advance in the company for fear of becoming ineligible. A working mother is penalized if her older children have the initiative and ambition to take jobs and add to the family income. A young couple who both want to work hard to escape poverty and slums become ineligible. This built-in deterrent to incentive has been a problem recognized in some of our welfare and public housing systems which it seems important not to reproduce. Moreover, since replicability is a major goal of this project, a low tuition would be a more attractive policy for industry. It is difficult to imagine very many industries being willing to duplicate programs limited to "the poor" when the whole effort of industry is toward incentive, advancement, and production. Industry is unlikely to be receptive to policies which could cause disruptions and divisions among its employees, and stifle incentive.

Family Structure: Quantitative ceilings on eligibility rule out families with two working parents, whose double earnings would make them ineligible. There are few couples at KLH. Many KLH employees are women, Negro and white, who are the sole support of their families. If the problem of broken homes is a serious one among the poor, as some evidence indicates, then the government should give some thought to avoiding rewarding broken families over two-parent ones in its policies of eligibility for programs. The government, while it clearly cannot have caused this deep-rooted problem, has contributed to it in some of its welfare policies. Limiting child care programs to home with one working parent would be providing one more reason, and a strong one, for breaking up marriages.

It may be that a family with two working members is a desirable transitional step for some families with a strong matriarchal history, toward a pattern more in line with the national pattern. At least in working families the children would be brought up in work-oriented homes, with fathers present. Removing the strain of poverty from these marriages might help to prevent their deterioration. In the long run, their economic security might do more to prevent the future unemployment of their sons than a policy of discouraging two-parent families from both working. It seems desirable not to exclude children of working couples from eligibility for day care.

Social Integration: Including children from all levels in the company would add to the school's value for all the children. Because a good intergroup mixture of children will produce a far more educating atmosphere, it is desirable to try to include all the children who apply. Enrolling all the children is the best possible way of demonstrating that American children are equally valuable and deserve equality of opportunity. Yet the government is not committed to subsidize all pre-school children, and certainly not on the all-day basis suggested here.

A sliding scale tuition eliminates all these problems by safeguarding that the government money goes only to those who need it, without making a sharp line between the poor and the non-poor in the same company.

The fee setting decision did not involve a consideration of the costs of the Center, its potential use, or the sources and level of funding. The Center's actual fee structure was determined by the Board of Trustees' Admissions and Fees Committee. In the committee's opinion the parent's ability to pay and their perception of what was reasonable and fair were the principal criteria for determining the appropriate fee schedule.

Accordingly, the committee obtained a suggested minimum and maximum fee range from the parents on the committee. The suggested range was $5 to $20 per week per child depending on the relationship of family size to income levels of the parents. When more than one child per family is enrolled, the first pays 100 per cent of the base fee, the second 50 per cent, the third 30 per cent, and additional children 10 per cent.

How are Children Enrolled?

The staff placed posters in the plant asking workers who were interested in enrolling their children in the program to sign the posters. It was made clear on the posters that signing did not automatically enroll the child in the Center. Some twenty parents signed the posters.

The twenty names provided the basis for obtaining some of the children for the pilot program. The rest of the children were enrolled when the KLH company personnel office made new employees aware of the Center's existence, and leads were provided by the KLH personnel director.

During the pilot program period no active recruitment of children took place, principally because there was no room for additional children. However, once the permanent facility was opened, the staff arranged a series of tours of the Center for KLH employees. These tours of twenty-five employees each were conducted during the work day to demonstrate the service available. From that point on, children are enrolled on a first-come, first served basis.

Lease or Buy a Building?

The unique aspects of industry-related day care require the day care facility to be close by the parents' place of employment. The expected

advantages of proximity have been set forth earlier in this report. However, one major disadvantage has been that the land and buildings near the KLH plant are among the most costly in Cambridge due to the closeness of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the easy access by public transportation. Given the facts that the corporation did not have any suitable available space and the Center lacked funds for building purposes, the trustees decided the only feasible alternative was to seek leased space in the vicinity of the KLH plant. Also, the trustees felt it was more desirable to invest their limited funds in the program rather than a plant.

There were few suitable buildings available in the KLH plant area. The original plan was to rent a small building which the landlord had intended to renovate for the Center. During the period of waiting for the grant for operating expenses, this building was sold. The Center's next experience in finding a permanent facility was a costly one. After entering into a lease with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for a building and spending $18,000 on architects fees, the Center had to break the lease because it could not afford the renovations. Subsequently, the Center leased the present Lansdowne Street building for $12,000 per year plus utilities and property taxes. This building, which was formerly used as a frozen food warehouse, required renovations in excess of $40,000.

Pick-Up Parents?

Clearly, it is very inconvenient for some parents to bring children to and from the Center on public transportation each day. The Trustees recognized this problem, but felt they could not do very much about it. The wide geographic dispersion of the children's homes made a pick-up and

delivery service very costly. Nevertheless, during the pilot study period the Trustees considered on an experimental basis picking up parents and children at a conveniently located subway station. This idea was short-lived as a number of other KLH employees with no connection with the Center wanted the transportation service extended to include them. They claimed it was a form of discrimination to offer it only to one group of employees. As a result, the Trustees decided the inconvenience of public transportation was something everyone would have to live with for the time being.

OBSERVATIONS

It is always dangerous to generalize from the experiences of one program, especially one that is breaking new ground and has only operated on a limited scale. Nevertheless, the Children's Bureau believed it would be useful for others seeking to replicate the Center's program if the initial report presented a tentative list of lessons others might glean from the experiences of the KLH Child Development Center during its three years of development and eight months of pilot program. Whether or not these observations are a function of the Center's unique circumstances, and hence, not relevant to others, or are in fact, of a more general significance cannot be determined at this time.

The team's principal observations were:

. It is difficult to get extensive, continuing and meaningful parent involvement.

There are many reasons why working parents may find it difficult to become involved. They are tied to their jobs during the working day. They have limited education and social skills which make it hard for them to feel comfortable with other members of the Board. There is no pay for

time spent on Center matters. They have other children and family responsibilities. They have no interest in being involved. It is difficult to get committed to something somebody else is already doing with great competence. If the Board and staff are making all the decisions, and if the parents feel there is nothing needed from them in this situation, they are unlikely to become involved.

One solution others might consider exploring is to get the parents involved on the planning stage by undertaking such tasks as plant surveys. In this way the parents might feel more authorship of the program. Workers may also be more willing to communicate with those who probably already know of their circumstances. However, with this approach, everyone would have to realize that the program might not be started unless adequate funding were obtained. Later, using a Board/Committee model similar to the Center's, it may be necessary to pay parents for time spent on the program. Coffee and lunch breaks should be utilized as much as possible to conduct Board and Committee meetings for the convenience of the parents.

It is interesting to note that the research team in its interviews with parents found no evidence that the KLH working mothers were dissatisfied because of the lack of progress toward parent control or that these women even wanted to help control the Center. They are more interested in pragmatic questions involving quality of education, meals and health services. The main push for parent control is from the Board, the incorporators and the Children's Bureau. The implications of this apparent one-sided interest in parent control will be researched during the second phase of the research program.

. A lead time of at least six months, free of problems created

by funding sources, is needed by staff and Board committees to accomplish such tasks as developing a program outline, obtaining a tax-exempt number, making building renovations, training and many other similar matters.

. From the earliest planning stage the project needs to be under the control of a competent administrator. The administrator may well need the assistance of consultants specializing in the application of the systems approach to the integral development of the legal, tax, business, educational and service aspects of public service programs.

Although the KLH CDC does have dedicated, intelligent people who are experts in social welfare and education, their creative and imaginative work is occasionally forestalled by the necessity of engaging in purely administrative functions which are beyond their training. The operation of the center requires an administrative consultant whose duty would be to alleviate the time consuming paper and inter-personal explanatory burdens which fall unfairly on these professional educators. An administrative consultant is needed who is experienced in:

(a) The systems approach to planning and project implementation so that first things are done first, and that contingency plans are formulated before crises arise.

(b) The allocation of limited resources between competing alternative proposals so that the optimum satisfaction of goals is achieved.

(c) The application of cost minimization techniques consistent with the level of desired professional service quality.

(d) Operating with the structure of government and business, which requres an intimate knowledge of the language, goals and processes in these areas.

(e) Working with professionals in the social, welfare, and educational fields.

(f) Dealing with people who want to help but who may disrupt the program's progress.

In addition to her educational programs some of these tasks were performed by the Executive Director. She was obviously not experienced in a manner which would satisfy the requirements suggested above. In spite of her lack of business, legal and organizational structure education, however, she performed with distinction. In the judgement of the research team, the personal and emotional drives of this individual were such that she was able to overcome many problems which others would probably not have been able to resolve in similar situations. This is important to mention for two reasons: first, the center did become operational in spite of a lack of an experienced administrative consultant, and second, one or two highly motivated individuals played key roles to bring about a functioning center.

Having an experienced administrative consultant would not only lend timely expertise where it is needed, but also would free the professional educators to attend the tasks for which they were hired.

The services of the experienced and well qualified administrator are needed mostly during the planning, development and initial operating periods.

Once the program is fully operational the administrative requirements are not as demanding. High quality administrators are costly and hard to find for short periods of employment. Two solutions, which are not mutually exclusive, may be:

(a) The sponsoring company could assign the time of one of its executives to the project as its administrative consultant during the initial period of its planning, development and operations.

(b) The Center could hire qualified outside consultants.

The use of a company executive has two disadvantages. First, if the Center is trying to establish an independent image the active role of a member of management may damage this image. Second, the executive may not be experienced in dealing with professional people or professional matters. The use of consultants may overcome these problems, but the consultants' time will be more expensive than the time of an executive.

Continuing with the research team's observations:

. The sponsoring company runs a great risk if it adopts a "hands off" policy toward the Center.

The Center needs the kind of expertise the company can provide and the company cannot afford to let the Center flounder and fail because these inputs are missing. The KLH Research and Development Corp. has a lot at stake in this project and, on several occasions, the fate of the project has been in jeopardy.

It is the opinion of the research team that several of these crises may have been averted if the company had kept itself better informed of the Center's activities on a continuing basis. Despite the problem of establishing independence, direct representation of the company by one of

its top management group on the Board of Trustees may be the best solution to this problem. Whatever the solution adopted, the company cannot sit back and wait for the staff of the Center to bring their problems to it. The staff has not been trained to identify, in their embryonic form, the kinds of problems the company can best deal with. Therefore, such problems are usually already in the crisis stage when recognized by the staff and brought to the company. At that point in time many attractive alternatives that were open earlier may be closed.

. The goals of the program should be clear to all involved and established as early as possible.

It has been difficult for many of the people involved in the KLH project to agree on its principal purposes. There are those who see it as servicing only KLH working mothers. Others view it as being more community-oriented, and some are confused as to whether or not it is primarily for former welfare recipients. This confusion has led to some problems in program development and some unnecessary criticisms of the Center's actions. It has meant that during the first year much time was wasted discussing issues which may not have been relevant to the Center.

. Those persons involved in government, business, social work and education may have difficulty working together. Each has a different set of values and a somewhat stereotyped notion of the other parties' set of values.

Mrs. Morgan, in her President's Report at the first annual meeting of the KLH Child Development Center spoke of this problem:

> In trying to understand the problems we have encountered, I am coming to realize how the value systems of different groups in our society clash, and how inaccurate is each group's perception of the values of other groups. This project was designed with

a set of basic underlying assumptions reflecting one set of values. Many of the questions raised about the project reflect different underlying values. Our attempts to give the right answers to the wrong questions have often distorted the project.

This conflict represents to me a central opportunity for this demonstration project in the coming year. If we can come to understand and resolve conflicts between some of the half-recognized values which influence decision makers in business, government, and social service, and if we can begin to formulate the right questions, then this project could serve as an important bridge. If we continue to try to respond to the wrong questions, little will be learned.

One easy to understand example of what I mean is the question of whether the project was intended to be a service project or a research project. This is not a valid question, in my opinion. Clearly, what was proposed was to investigate the feasibility and some of the effects of a particular service.

Questions raised around company control reflect a real conflict in underlying values. There is an assumption that the company and the Center are somehow adversaries. Responding to the wrong questions could prevent the company from contributing its special expertise in a way which could be very helpful in this project. It seems important to me that more effort be spent in investigating and trying to reconcile underlying assumptions in order to try to formulate valid questions.

I believe the wrong questions about Board-staff relationships have undermined normal Board development. Worse than that, I am afraid the misunderstandings and pressure may have made us take a defensive step back from the idea of parent control. A parent Board would be a unique contribution which this Center could make to the much-discussed national issue of citizens' participation in the decision making of services they use. Our Director is so well-qualified to work within this relationship that I think it is an experiment worth trying. I hope some day to see a lay Board of parents running the KLH project.

It may be that inaccurate perception of one another's value systems is an especially acute problem between the fields of social welfare and business. For this reason, the staff and the Advisory Committee of the Children's Bureau have shown both imagination and courage in supporting this project which is so likely to be misunderstood and criticized within their professional field. We are equally pleased and grateful for the support of members of our Advisory Committee during a period when suspicions and misinformation flourished.

. Novel demonstration projects are difficult enough to get started without trying to build into them a highly structured research element.

The problem with the original research team's trying to achieve a maximization of service and research goal was presented earlier. Whether or not the second approach to research utilized in this project will be any more successful has yet to be demonstrated. There is little doubt that the staff and trustees were happier with the supportive role the second team adopted. The price, however, may be a more anthropological (and hence less predictive) approach to research due to the inappropriateness of the program design for controlled research.

. The leadership of a committed, capable person who is willing to devote a considerable amount of time is essential in getting the program funded, developed and implemented.

The KLH Child Development Center's history is full of delays, frustration, confusion, and disappointment. It took two years of dedicated work to get funding and another year to begin the pilot program. If others can learn from the KLH experiences, they may be able to avoid some of the same mistakes and problems. Nevertheless, in the opinion of the research team, even if funding is more readily available it will never be an easy task to involve parents, industry, government, researchers, staff and the community in projects requiring their joint collaboration.

THE TASK AHEAD

The Center begins its third year of operations as a legal corporation in May, 1969. The Executive Director described her objectives for this and the following years to the research team. Her outlined statement reproduced below should provide the reader with some insight into the

character of the program, the interests of the staff and their evaluation of their unfinished tasks:

General Goals

(a) Secure funding after June of 1970.

(b) Reach an enrollment of sixty or eighty children with priority to KLH children, but opening up to other industries in the area.

(c) Continued development of the physical facilities - including the outdoor play-yard. Keeping the budget in mind - renovations should stay within 60-80 thousand dollars.

(d) To develop model program, especially in relation to limits on grouping of children by numbers.

(e) To offer supportive Social Services in keeping with family needs.

For Staff of Center

(a) To attract and hire mature and excellent teachers of pre-school children.

(b) To upgrade itself internally by advancing teacher's aids to assistant teachers and then to teachers. The advancement will be based on merit.

(c) To meet the staff's needs for enrichment and continued growth by creating a reasonable, but unique staff scheduling pattern and an in-service training component.

(d) To build a child care staff that will remain with the Center a number of years.

For Children

(a) To provide a program of superb quality that meets the rest, food, intellectual and health needs of individuals and groups.

(b) To offer consistency to children between home and school so as to lessen confusion and divergency in its expectations of the children.

(c) To offer a nourishing, yet enjoyable meal plan including breakfast, lunch and snacks each day.

(d) To work with parents in developing a sound health program for each child.

(e) To assess at the beginning of the year (or child's entrance into program) each child's need for stimulation in the intellectual areas, thereby presenting material appropriate to his level.

(f) To keep accurate records on child's growth pattern in all areas so as to answer the question: What has <u>this</u> Center meant to this child's development?

(g) To keep the program from becoming <u>institutionalized</u>! Long hours tend to enforce an unnecessary routine which is geared mainly to the needs of adults rather than the children. It is crucial to have lead teachers, the assistant director or the director rotate school opening at 6:30 a.m. This will insure the necessary contact with parents on a professional level.

<u>For Parents</u>

(a) To encourage as much participation in the over-all program as possible, such as having lunch with children, visiting during school hours, being informed when their child is ill or hurt, and serving on Board Committees.

(b) To examine the parent's tight schedule periodically to determine how much participation they desire and how much is realistic.

(c) To have an on-going dialogue with parents about the program and its goals, answering such questions as: What do they want for their children? Where do the children go from here? What kind of program am I offered? How do they feel about it? Should children be free to move, or do they expect to see them sitting still over work books?

(d) To gradually begin <u>real</u> participation as interest and knowledge about the director of the program become clearer to parents. If they are not overwhelmed by the program, they may enjoy being around the school.

V. RESEARCH PROPOSAL: THE BROAD OUTLINE OF PART II OF THE KLH PROJECT

One of the research team's principle tasks during the first phase of the research project was to develop the research design to be implemented during the second phase of the project. For funding and operational reasons, this design had to be capable of being implemented over a 12-month period and acceptable to all parties involved. This section presents the broad outline of the agreed upon research design.

The second phase of the KLH Child Development research project will concentrate primarily upon the variables that are unique to educationally oriented work-related day-care and tied to a work situation dedicated to non-discriminatory hiring practices, employee training, and advancement. The research team will measure the expected effects of these variables upon:

(a) The children enrolled

(b) The participating parents

(c) The company

(d) The community

The unique variables of the work-related day-care program are:

1. The mother and child are in close proximity to each other during the working day.
2. The child is under the parent's control longer during the day since the child comes to and from work with the parent.
3. The parent can be trained at the same place where he or she will be employed eventually on a regular basis. Consequently, no new child care arrangements need be made once the training phase is over. Subsequently, as the parent's income rises the parent again

need not make new day-care arrangements.

4. Industrial-related day care involves government and industry working together under parent control.

The secondary areas of research will be:

(a) to determine the cost-benefit relationship from the point of view of:

(i) the parents enrolled

(ii) the company

(iii) society as a whole

(b) to evaluate the adequacy of the pre-school educational environment and learning experience at the KLH Child Development Center.

(c) to document and appraise the critical decisions outstanding as of May 1969 and those not yet apparent which affect in a significant manner the program's objectives, structure, content and operations.

It is proposed the test period begin with the opening of the Center's permanent facility in May 1969 and end 12 months later. The team's report would then be submitted during the late summer of 1970.

Effect on Children, Parents and Families

In carrying out the research the team will concentrate upon (1) establishing the differences between those parents and children enrolled in the Center and those qualified parents and children who are not, and (2) the effect of the presence or absence of the principal variable, work-related day care, on these two parent-children groups. This decision was based upon the following considerations:

(a) The demonstration project's uniqueness relates to its work-related aspects.

(b) Many of the expected benefits flow from the assumption that the project will switch parents with unsatisfactory day-care options from a welfare to an employee status.

(c) It is anticipated that another group of expected benefits will be realized when parents already employed by KLH (or others) and who have unsatisfactory day care arrangements switch to that which they perceive to be a more satisfactory work-related day-care arrangement.

(d) There exists a great variety of day care center programs and alternative day care arrangements. To demonstrate the advantages and disadvantages of work-related day care relative to any one of these particular alternative models may lead to conclusions that have a limited range of application. Few day care arrangements duplicate each other in many respects. More meaningful conclusions can be reached when the comparison is made between what workers perceive to be satisfactory and unsatisfactory day care arrangements. Therefore, when viewing the effect of the Center on those not enrolled, it will be assumed they regard the Center as a less desirable day care arrangement. The reverse will be true when the point of view of the enrolled parent is examined.

(e) The collection of data is simplified since only one management group, locality, and set of records is involved.

The basic experimental design will require the designation of a control group which will consist of those parents, and their children, employed by KLH who qualify for participation in the Center, but who do not use it. Based upon an earlier plant survey, conducted during the first part of the research, it was established that a significant number of qualified parents will not send their children to the Center. The earlier survey also indicated the principal difference between the control and test groups should be whether or not their children are enrolled in the Center.

Obviously, the test group will be the employee parents and their children enrolled in the program.

Once the control group is defined, the research team will first establish the characteristics of the test and control groups (which will no doubt lead to comparable sub-categories being identified within the test and control groups) and then measure the changes in the identifiable characteristics of the groups over the test period. Of particular interest will be the reasons why the control group did not enroll in the program.

Using this test and control group arrangement the team will concentrate on identifying and measuring the values of the parents and the characteristics of their children and families to determine the effects of the program on the test group.

To the extent possible the children in the test and control group will be subjected to a number of standard measures of health, intelligence, developmental inventory, language development and behavior. Those measurements will be made at the beginning and end of the test period and the results compared using the appropriate statistical tests of significance.

The value system of the parents in the test and control groups will be identified and those values relevant to child rearing, education,

community work, race and other areas touched by the program will be sampled periodically to determine if they change over time.

Family characteristics of the test and control groups will also be sampled over time to determine the effects of the program on such family characteristics as: stability, relationships and social mobility.*

Several times during the test period the whole work force will be tested through simple questionnaires to determine their attitude towards and perception of the program. In addition, the Personnel Department will provide data, collected every six months, describing the characteristics of the work force. Analysis of this data will determine if there are any major changes which might affect the research conclusions. Complete information on new employees qualified to participate in the program will be obtained directly from the Personnel Department whenever such people are hired.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

The cost-benefit analysis will identify the cost inputs (in-kind, cash and opportunity costs, if any) and relate these inputs to the measurable

---

*The proposed research related to children, values, and family is similar to that recommended by the original research team. The principal difference between this proposal and theirs lies in the definition of the control group. The original team's research recommendation also covered (1) the approach used by the program staff to enter the plant and gain acceptance and (2) the translation of the educational concept into bricks and mortar. Both of these areas are covered in our first report. One other area the original team proposed to research was the community reception and attitudes toward the program. To date there has been little interaction between the program and the community. Initial interviews conducted with community officials during the first phase of the research indicated they had very neutral feelings regarding the Center and in most cases knew little of its actual program. Perhaps this will change once the program is fully operational. If so, we will conduct interviews with community officials touched by the program to ascertain their attitude toward the program. At the present time we do not believe this will represent a significant part of our research effort.

benefits derived from these inputs. As indicated earlier, the cost-benefit analysis will be made from the following points of view:

(a) the company

(b) the parents

(c) society as a whole

The team does not anticipate any major problems in measuring costs. A system has already been established for collecting data on in-kind inputs. The financial records of the company and Center should provide the cash outlays devoted to the program. Parent interviews will be the source of data related to parent costs. The major problem will be the estimation of opportunity costs.

The expected measurable benefits and the procedure for obtaining the required data are:

Expected Benefit	Source of Data
1. Reduction in welfare costs	1. Interviews with parents placing children in Center to determine (1) were they on welfare before joining KLH (2) what change will employment make in their welfare situation and (3) what difference the Center made in their decision and ability to work. A similar interview will be held with control group parents to test the importance of the Center to their employment decision.[1]
2. Net reduction in cost of day care and other child maintenance costs for participants.	2. Previous and new costs related to day care and child maintenance will be obtained from participating parent interviews.

[1]These interviews will also provide data to test the hypothesis that the Center widens the pool of potential workers since it will establish the influence of the work-related day care center on the movement of people from unemployment to employment.

Expected Benefit	Source of Data
3. Generation of more taxable income, taxable spending and social security payments.	3. Payroll records, employee interviews concerning previous and current wage levels and expenditures/savings patterns.
4. Avoidance of training costs and the cost of lost productive hours due to turnover, tardiness and absenteeism.	4. Company records related to training costs, employee time cards and personnel records. The history and performance of the test group of participating parents will be compared to the control group.
5. Avoidance of costs associated with transference of participant and children between programs.	5. Possible sources unknown at this time.
6. Reduction in the cost of scrap and work which fails to meet quality standards.	6. The scrap inspection records of the test and control group will be compared.
7. Avoidance by community of cost of day care.	7. Comparable day care facility costs will be obtained from a local community center.
8. Potential increased lifetime earnings of participants.	8. Estimated by research team after review of employee's potential without day care arrangements. Care must be taken to recognize this benefit only in the case of parents who are working because day care and job training is provided.

There are a number of intangible benefits which can be measured objectively, but with no easily assigned dollar values. Some of these include educational achievement, improved employee morale, increased employee self-respect and self-esteem, better health, improved family relations and many more, most of which have been mentioned elsewhere in this preliminary proposal. The cost-benefit portion of the research findings will include a description of these qualitative benefits.

Education

The education-oriented portion of the research proposal will evaluate

the adequacy of the Center's pre-school educational environment and the learning experience. The following outline sets forth the general areas for investigation. As previously indicated, there will be pre-testing in terms of aptitude, achievement and social skills. These controlled procedures for testing and pre-testing will be against benchmarks set by the staff in their own program standards. In addition, the educational needs of the parents will be identified and the adequacy of the program tested against these needs. The adequacy of the program will also be tested against whatever standards are specified by relevant external groups, such as Head Start.

The two major areas for investigation are:

(1) Identification of needs and resources available to satisfy defined needs.

(a) Physical Plant

(i) Capacity

(ii) Health, protection and safety

(iii) Functionality for learning

(iv) Adaptability for program adjustment

(b) Staffing

(i) Staff required

(ii) Qualifications of Staff provided

(c) Program

(i) Structure and adaptability for change

(ii) Operation and implementation

2. Satisfaction of defined needs

(a) Educational

(b) Nutritional

(c) Psychological

(d) Other

The propositions to be tested and the sources of test data are:

A. Identification of needs and resources available to satisfy defined needs:

(1) Physical Plant: KLH CDC physical plant meets the child care needs of present and new employees.

(a) Capacity

(i) Survey present employees to determine the desirability of the proposed center.

(ii) Measure the use of the facility by children of present employees.

(iii) Survey new employees to determine the desirability of the proposed center.

(iv) Measure the use of the facility by children of new employees.

(b) Health, Protection and Safety: KLH CDC is more than adequate in providing protection for life and health of program participants.

(i) Obtain public and/or licensing agencies requirements necessary to satisfy health, protection and safety of program participants.

(ii) Prepare a check list of requirements satisfied.

(c) Functionality for Learning: KLH CDC has allocated educational facility in a fashion that satisfies accepted educational norms.

(i) Measure space allocated for classroom, lavatories, dining and rest and recreation, etc.

(ii) Compare space alloted per child with accepted norms.

(d) Adaptability for Program Adjustment: KLH CDC as it is presently constituted can provide services only to pre-school children without physical or emotional problems.

(i) Offer a qualified opinion as to the capability of the center to adapt to a change in the type of child services needed.

(ii) The research team will answer questions of the following nature: Can the facility provide services to physically handicapped children, infants and/or emotionally disturbed children? Can the center provide services for older-than-pre-school children during weekly and/or summer school vacation?

(2) Staffing: KLH CDC has an administrative and operational staff compatible with the educational, nutritional, and psychological needs of program participants. (Based on the research team's findings in 1., (a), (b), and (c), above, and opinions formed by observing operation of the school prior to its operating at the present facility, staff requirements will be defined.)

(a) Staff Services Required: Administrative staff required to provide operations such as: Educational, nutritional, and other staff. Payroll, foods and educational material. Implementation of educational programs and other requirements.

(b) Qualifications of Staff Provided:

(i) Document personnel hired to meet staffing needs and examine their professional preparedness.

(ii) Disclose unfulfilled staff needs and unnecessary personnel.

(3) Program: KLH CDC has a satisfactory, viable educationally-oriented day care program.

(a) Structure and Adaptability for Change

(i) Program which should be offered

(ii) Program offered

(b) Assess the operating educational program in comparison to (3), (a), (i) and (ii), above.

B. Satisfaction of Defined Needs: The total educational experience of the children participating in the KLH CDC program is at least equivalent to other similar educationally-oriented pre-school day care programs.

(a) Appropriate standard tests will be administered to measure the characteristics of the children upon entering the program.

(b) The children will be re-tested periodically.

(c) The changes will be compared with the staff's program standards and the standards obtained from similar non-industrial day care center educational programs.

Critical Decisions and Relationships

The research team has already collected valuable information independently and in collaboration with the Center's staff and with the Company management that will permit it to describe and evaluate a number of critical areas which were still either waiting for a final decision, were under review, or were in transition at the May 1969 cut-off date of the first report. These

decisions involve the following areas:

(a) Board development and parent control.

(b) The nature of the relationship with the community.

(c) The character of the relationship between the company-center-staff-employees and parents.

(d) The sources of permanent funding.

(e) The specific program specifications in the areas of health, education and social welfare.

Progress has been made in these areas and once the program is settled in its new permanent facility it is expected these open issues will be resolved quickly. The second research report will cover these decisions.

Data related to these issues, and any new ones which arise during the second research period, will be obtained from interviews with the parties involved, Company and Center records, and direct observations by the team, of meetings and incidents related to the issues.

In addition to new critical decisions, the team proposes to trace through the test period the results of key decisions already made before the May 1969 cut-off date. These decisions are identified in the initial report.

Next Step

Once the general thrust of the research is approved, the team will work with the staff of the Center to develop a set of substantive hypotheses in the agreed upon areas. In addition, a detailed design for the collection and analysis of data related to these hypotheses will be prepared. The members of the first phase research team plus additional qualified individuals from the education and social welfare fields will participate in this activity.

APPENDIX A

KLH CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER, INC.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION SUBMITTED TO CHILDREN'S BUREAU WITH REQUEST FOR 1969-70 GRANT*

1. PERSONNEL

Professional

Director - The Center requires a Director with above average training, experience, and maturity. Continuation of the previously approved salary is necessary for retention or recruitment of such a person.

Assistant Director - The Center requires a social worker whose training, experience, and maturity will enable him to meet the high expectations of the program. Continuation of the previously approved salary is necessary for retention or recruitment of such a person.

Head Teacher - In order that the program for sixty children will be of the high quality desired, an experienced teacher will be required who has sufficient knowledge and skill to plan such a program and sufficient organizational ability to implement it. The budgeted salary is necessary to attract and retain such a person.

Teachers - Well qualified teachers are essential to the implementation of a sound educational program. We are asking for salaries with which we can retain (or hire, if necessary) the services of one experienced teacher and one recent graduate on a full time basis. The salaries listed are in line with comparable positions in the area. Two such teachers (total of three teachers) are the minimum number that can provide coverage and supervision in the large building we will occupy. There will be considerable reliance on teacher aides; without whom additional teachers would be required.

Teacher Aides - In a program with sixty children, a minimum of eight teacher aides will be required to maintain a children to adult ratio of 5.5 to 1 (counting only the three teachers and eight aides who will have direct daily contact with the children). In order to provide incentive for aides and prospective aides to apply and continue with the program, a base pay rate of $2.00 per hour ($4160 per year) is desirable. If the two aides presently with the program continue, they should receive an increment to $2.15 per hour ($4472 per year).

*Prepared by the staff of the KLH Child Development Center.

We are asking for the government to pay the salaries of the two aides presently with the program and four new teacher aides. The remaining two aides are to be hired out of tuition receipts which will be sufficient to cover this expense if sixty children are enrolled and may not be enough if less are enrolled -- in which case the aides will not be needed.

Of the eight aides who will contribute to the 5.5 to 1 children to adults ratio, one will be hired with the expectation that she will be qualified to and interested in doing the cooking for the children and one will be asked to serve as a health aide after being trained by the nurse. This, plus the fact that no one person will be asked to spend an entire eight hour day in direct contact with the children means that the actual children to staff ratio at any one time will be greater than 5.5 to 1. We will, however, be able to lower the ratio by use of student trainees, volunteers, and administrative staff. Thus, the use of eight aides, six paid for by government funds, is an absolute minimum.

Nurse - KLH will provide $1500 from which we may contract for a nurse for daily visits, for consultation, and for emergencies.

Clerical - A full time executive secretary has been found to be a necessity. We are requesting the government to pay half of her salary and KLH Research and Development Corporation to pay the other half.

Maintenance - KLH will provide maintenance services in kind to the value of $1,000.

Medical & Dental - KLH will provide $500 from which we may contract within the community for any necessary service which cannot be provided by the parent.

Cleaning - KLH will provide cleaning services in kind to the value of $2200. This is a minimum figure for routine cleaning of our large building.

Snow Removal - To be provided in kind by KLH Research and Development Corporation.

Research Sub-Contract - The research will be conducted by the Social Administration Research Institute.

FICA & Benefits - It is estimated that FICA, Insurance and other benefits will run approximately 12½% of salaries and wages.

2. SUPPLIES

Program Supplies - The amount requested is a minimum figure for adequate consumable supplies for daily program use. We are asking the government for $1700 (no change from last year) and the balance will be made up from tuition receipts.

Office Supplies & Postage - KLH will supply to a value of $900.

Food - It is estimated that the cost of feeding one child per month will be $15. This includes breakfast, lunch, and two snacks per day. We are requesting $6,800 of the $10,800 required with the balance to come from KLH Research and Development Corporation.

3. TRAVEL

Field Trips, Clinic - Transportation for field trips by the children will be paid for from fee receipts. It is essential to the program that the children be exposed to experiences in the community beyond the confines of the school. This amount would also cover the costs for necessary trips to medical and dental clinics.

Professional Travel, Dues & Subscriptions - This item will both enable staff to learn from the experiences of others in the field and also will enable staff to accept invitations outside the city or state for the purpose of explaining the nature of our program in response to requests from other persons, groups, industries, or government.

4. EQUIPMENT

Program - We are requesting a conservative amount for this item in the hope that some equipment will be donated to us. Equipment required will have a value far above this figure. For example, nap cots and mattress for fifty more children at $15 a set will cost $750, or 75% of our request. We have had donated sufficient kitchen equipment.

5. OTHER EXPENDITURES

Rental of Space (Electricity, Taxes & Heat) - We have leased a different facility than that described in the budget request for 1968-69. The prior lease was broken without consequence and renovations (to be financed by donations) of the present facility will be substantially less expensive. The present lease if for five years with an annual rental of $12,000, not including taxes, insurance, heat, or electricity. Presently, we have been assessed $6,000 per year for real estate taxes leaving a balance of only $2,000 for the remaining items.

Telephone - KLH Research and Development will pay for telephone service.

Insurance - To be paid by KLH Research and Development covers adequate coverage for children, liability insurance for adults and the Center, fire, theft, and other comprehensive general purpose liability insurances.

Note:

Services in Kind - We will maintain a record of the value of services in kind.

Cash Contribution from KLH Research and Development Corporation, Inc. - Any cash balance will not be restricted to the designated budget item.

APPENDIX B

Work Force Survey Results

(Parents with Children Six Years & Under)

	Plant Personnel	Management Personnel
I. Sex:		
a) Male	28 (55%)	24 (96%)
b) Female	34 (45%)	1 (4%)
II. Address:		
a) Boston	4 (6.5%)	1 (4%)
b) Roxbury	4 (6.5%)	0
c) S. Boston/Dorchester	14 (23%)	1 (4%)
d) Cambridge/Somerville	29 (47%)	1 (4%)
e) Other	11 (17%)	22 (88%)
III. Labor Grades:		
10)	4 (6.5%)	
9)	24 (39%)	
8)	15 (24%)	
7)	8 (13%)	
6)	1 (1.5%)	
5)	3 (5%)	
4)	5 (8%)	
3)	0	
2)	2 (3%)	
IV. Length of Employment:		
a) Less than one year	22 (38.5%)	10 (40%)
b) One to two years	2 (3.5%)	5 (20%)
c) Two to three years	9 (16%)	1 (4%)
d) Three to four years	6 (10.5%)	5 (20%)
e) Four to five years	15 (26%)	4 (16%)
f) Five to six years	0	0
g) Six to seven years	2 (3.5%)	0
h) Seven to eight years	0	0
i) Eight years plus	1 (2%)	0
V. Transportation:		
a) MBTA	26 (42%)	1 (4%)
b) Own car	25 (40%)	21 (84%)
c) Car pool	3 (5%)	0
d) Walk	7 (11%)	1 (4%)
e) Other	1 (2%)	2 (8%)

	Plant Personnel	Management Personnel
VI. Length of Time to Work:		
a) 15 minutes or less	18 (29%)	1 (4%)
b) 16 to 20 minutes	11 (18%)	2 (8%)
c) 21 to 29 minutes	4 (6%)	1 (4%)
d) 30 to 44 minutes	18 (29%)	12 (48%)
e) 45 minutes plus	11 (18%)	9 (36%)
Employee Parents with Children Six Years or Under:		
Parents with one child	37 (59.5%)	9 (36%)
Parents with t children	19 (30.5%)	13 (52%)
Parents with three children	5 (8%)	1 (4%)
Parents with four children	1 (2%)	2 (8%)
Parents with five children	0	0
Parents with six children	0	0
Total Number of Children	94	46
VII. Ages of Children:		
a) Less than two years	33 (35%)	12 (26%)
b) Two years or more	61 (65%)	34 (74%)
IX. Sex of Children (Six or Under):		
a) Males	45 (48%)	22 (48%)
b) Females	49 (52%)	24 (52%)
X. Present Child Care Arrangements:		
a) Husband	1 (2%)	0
b) Wife	9 (14.5%)	23 (92%)
c) Relative/Neighbor in own home	30 (48%)	1 (4%)
d) Relative/Neighbor away from home	19 (30.5%)	0
e) Nursery or Day Care Center	1 (2%)	1 (4%)
f) Child's Grandmother	2 (3%)	0
XI. Weekly Cost of Day Care (other than wife or husband):		
a) Less than $10	3 (7.5%)	0
b) $10 to $14	18 (45%)	1 (4%)
c) $15 to $20	19 (47.5%)	0
XII. Satisfied with Present Day Care:		
a) Yes	50 (80.5%)	16 (64%)
b) No	1 (2%)	0
c) No Answer	11 (17.5%)	9 (36%)
XIII. Interested in Sending Child to Center:		
a) Yes	15 (24%)	5 (20%)
b) No	38 (61%)	17 (68%)
c) No Answer	9 (15%)	3 (12%)